DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 979 EC 303 854

AUTHOR Foreman, Phil; And Others
TITLE Services to Students with Mild Intellectual Disability. Research Report.
INSTITUTION Newcastle Univ., Callaghan (Australia). Special Education Centre.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 135p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Curriculum; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Practices; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Mainstreaming; *Mild Mental Retardation; Secondary School Teachers; Social Integration; *Special Education; Special Education Teachers; Student Characteristics; Student Placement; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (New South Wales)

ABSTRACT

A study of services to students with mild intellectual disability was conducted in two educational regions of New South Wales--Hunter and Metropolitan East. The scope of the study included students who were educated for some or all of the time in segregated support classes or in special schools or who were receiving assistance through the Early School Support Program. The study was based on a survey questionnaire completed by 68 teachers, interviews with 27 teachers, and classroom observations of 7 teachers. The study addressed teacher and class variables, integration and resources, curriculum and programming, and teaching strategies and management. The study found that: (1) 51 percent of teachers had an academic qualification in special education; (2) average class size was 13.3 children; (3) 48 percent of boys and 44 percent of girls were partly integrated; (4) social integration was seen as receiving more support than academic integration; (5) most teachers wished for more access than they were receiving to support services, particularly to therapy services and specialist facilities; (6) teachers' aide time was seen as inequitable in comparison with other special education classes; and (7) classroom observations revealed a variety of teaching techniques being used. Appendixes include copies of the survey forms, interview schedule, classroom observation scale, daily activities sheet, and weekly summary sheet. (Contains 20 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 380 979

University of Newcastle

Special Education Centre

Services to students with mild intellectual disability

Research Report

1994

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. J. Forrest
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EC 303854

University of Newcastle

Faculty of Education

Special Education Centre

Services to students with mild intellectual disability

RESEARCH REPORT

Research Team:

Phil Foreman
Ian Dempsey
Hedy Fairbairn
Bob Conway
Greg Robinson
Sue Spedding
Michael Arthur
Judy Cowley

Report prepared by

Phil Foreman
Ian Dempsey
Hedy Fairbairn
Bob Conway
Greg Robinson

Special Education Centre, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, 2308.
1994

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to teachers, principals and administrators in the Department of School Education, who co-operated in this research project, and to research assistants Agnes McMillan, Simon Maclean and Genevieve Wallace for their contribution. The research was funded through supplementation to ARC Infrastructure B funding, provided through the Research Management Committee, University of Newcastle.

CONTENTS

Executive summary 1

Introduction 3

Methodology 7

Teacher and class variables 12

Integration and resources 16

Curriculum and programming 25

Teaching strategies and management 29

Summary and conclusions 35

References 36

Appendix 38

ESSP survey form
SSP survey form
Primary survey form
Secondary survey form
Structured interview schedule
Classroom Observation Scale
Daily activities sheet
Weekly summary sheet

Executive Summary

A three stage study of services to students with mild intellectual disability was conducted in 1993 in two educational regions of New South Wales, Hunter and Metropolitan East. The decision to study two regions was based on the need to obtain a reasonably comprehensive picture of what was happening in services for students with mild intellectual disability. The purpose was not to make comparisons between regions, although some differences emerged in the course of analysis.

In the first stage of the study, an extensive questionnaire was sent to all teachers working in programs for students with mild intellectual disability (IM teachers) in Department of School Education facilities in the two regions. The second stage was an individual interview of a sample of teachers responding to Stage 1, subdivided into ESSP, Primary, Secondary and SSP. Stage 3 involved observations in the classrooms of a sample of the teachers from Stage 2 in each of the four sub-categories.

The main findings of the study were as follows:

1. Response rates for all services were better for the Hunter Region than for Metropolitan East Region, possibly due to local contact. The overall response rate for questionnaires was 62% (68/110). Twelve teachers were interviewed and four observed in Metropolitan East Region, 15 interviewed and three observed in Hunter Region.

2. Most IM teachers in the sample were female (76%). There were twice as many males in Hunter as in Metropolitan East.

3. Fifty-one per cent of the sample of teachers had an academic qualification in special education.

4. Seventy-one per cent stated that their present position was their preferred teaching position. Eighty-eight per cent were satisfied or very satisfied with their present position. Six per cent would prefer not to be in special education.

5. The IM classes surveyed contained 62.4% boys.

6. Average class size was 13.3, with 3.9 children who were seen as behaviour problems (3 boys, 0.9 girls).

7. Non-academic (social) integration was seen by teachers as receiving more support from the executive, other teachers, other students and the community than academic integration.

8. Primary IM and ESSP teachers perceived more support for integration than did secondary IM teachers.

9. Teachers reported more planned academic integration occurring in Metropolitan East region than in Hunter Region.

10. Forty-eight per cent of boys and 44% of girls were partly integrated.

11. A variety of school variables and student variables were reported by teachers to affect the possibility and outcome of integration programs.

12. A model of integration recommended by several teachers was the extension of the ESSP model into primary and secondary settings (i.e. with the IM teacher acting as a support to mainstreamed students with mild intellectual disability).

13. Most teachers wished for more access than they were receiving to support services, particularly to therapy services and specialist facilities. Many also expressed concern that ISTB, STLD and ESL services did not appear to be available to IM classes.

14. There appears to be no teachers' aide time allocated to IM classes in Hunter Region, whereas IM classes in Metropolitan East receive about one day per week. In both regions, lack of aide time was seen as inequitable in comparison with other special education classes.

15. Teachers felt that Teachers' Aides (Special) should receive training.

16. Eighty-five per cent of teachers would like a specific curriculum for students with mild intellectual disability.

17. Eighty per cent of teachers would like inservice training and feedback on their programming.

18. Classroom observations revealed a variety of teaching techniques being used including small group instruction, teacher aide withdrawal, team teaching and individual instruction. Whole class instruction was commonly used. There was no observation of data-based instruction or of teaching of problem solving skills.

19. Some of the teachers interviewed felt that behaviour management formed a large part of their work while others did not. Most teachers whose classes were observed had strong classroom control, with occasional use of time-out seen in six of the seven classrooms.

INTRODUCTION

The provision of educational services to students with mild intellectual disability has been problematic for at least several decades. Current service provision continues to encourage debate about appropriate educational models for a group of students who may have difficulty accessing mainstream educational services, and who may have difficulty coping with the demands of regular classroom placement.

Although the area of mild intellectual disability attracted much attention in the 1960s and 1970s, it is now relatively ignored in the professional literature, in comparison to the fields of severe disabilities and learning disabilities. Indeed, some have argued that "this neglected group of children and their teachers are at risk of being lost in a discouraged and directionless field" (Polloway, Patton, Smith & Roderique, 1991, p. 143).

Estimates of the prevalence of mild intellectual disability in Australia vary because of a lack of national prevalence studies. However, two national studies of disability within the school-aged population have been conducted. The first (Andrews, Elkins, Berry & Burge, 1979) reported a prevalence rate for mild intellectual disability of 1.39% of the school population. In the second study, which collected data from a number of different sources, 87,000 Australian children at school are even estimated as having mild intellectual disability (Abbey, Robinson & Taylor, 1988). This would represent about 3% of the total school age population.

The research on placement of students with mild intellectual disability [illegible] for the purposes of [illegible] Although the [illegible] or classification of intellectual disability, many have become placements in a separate [illegible] setting. For example, Doherty (1982) estimated that 30% of NSW school students with mild intellectual disability were placed in support classes. Beyond this estimate, there are no national prevalence figures for the number of students with mild intellectual disability who are educated in support classes or special schools.

The transfer of students with mild intellectual disability from mainstream classes to support classes in NSW usually occurs at or around grade 3. Typically, these students enter these classes with no or few reading and number skills, and they may also be deficient in social skills. The maximum IM class size is 18 students. Not all teachers of students with mild intellectual disability have special education training, and teachers aide support is not generally provided to the class (Center, Ward, Ferguson, Conway & Linfoot, 1991). For some students, placement in a support class is seen as an opportunity to "catch up" essential academic skills to allow their later reintegration into mainstream classes. However, for most students in support classes, their placement is long term and typically continues at least until secondary school and sometimes throughout secondary school.

Student characteristics

The characteristics of students with mild intellectual disability are not widely known. An American analysis of 107 primary school students with mild intellectual disability by Epstein, Polloway, Patton and Foley (1989), showed that 7% of the sample had a behaviour disorder. Additionally, a range of sensory and health related problems for the students was also reported. The findings were that students with mild intellectual disability would have multiple

impairments, and that the majority of the students would receive some form of related health or therapy service(s). However, an evaluation of school-based therapy services in NSW suggested that despite an identified need, these students usually did not gain access to these services (NSW Department of Education, 1989).

Although teachers have rated over 50% of their students in these classes as being accepted or popular with their peers, over 20% of these students have been seen as rejected or neglected (Polloway, Epstein, Patton, Cullinan, & Luebke, 1986). Students with mild intellectual disability appear to display significantly more behaviour problems than their peers without a disability. Boys are more likely to be placed in support classes for students with mild intellectual disability than girls (Ward et al., 1991; Polloway et al., 1986), and boys in support classes are more likely to display conduct problems that girls (Polloway, Epstein, & Cullinan, 1985), and up to 20% of the students in these support classes have been rated as hyperactive (Polloway et al., 1986).

Generally, the post-school adjustment of students with mild intellectual disability is poor in several dimensions (Polloway, 1991). Some studies show that fewer than half of these students are successful in obtaining employment when they leave school, and that very few earn more than the minimum wage (Edgar, 1987). Apart from this information, which is largely American, little is known about the characteristics of students with mild intellectual disability in regular or special classes or in special schools.

Educational placement

The effectiveness of special education placement for students with mild intellectual disability has attracted renewed attention in the past decade. Debate about the regular education initiative (REI) has facilitated this. One of the most important issues raised by REI is the assumption that the educational needs of students with mild intellectual disability are sufficiently different from those of students without disability to warrant separate placement and special programs (Davis, 1990).

Several studies have demonstrated that students with mild intellectual disability cope adequately in mainstreamed settings. For example, in a meta analysis of studies on the integration of students with a disability, Wang and Baker (1986), concluded that either part-time or full-time integration into regular classes improved student performance, and attitudinal and process outcomes for integrated students. However, only 11 studies met the criteria for selection in this meta analysis. Consequently, the representation of some disability groups, including intellectual disability, was poor. In Australia, Center and Curry (1993) found that a group of primary school students with mild intellectual disability who were integrated into a regular class improved their basic academic skills significantly more than a comparison group who were placed in a special class.

A review of the efficacy of mainstreaming students with intellectual disability by Danby and Cullen (1988) concluded that the results of these studies are ambiguous and that no generalisations can be made from the results. They evaluated the British and United States literature based on five cornerstones of integration: losing labels, social benefits for integrated students, partnerships with parents, improved educational outcomes, and positive effects on peers. For labelling, the authors concluded that the literature is equivocal. For example, although the effects of labelling have been well demonstrated, the effects of different labelling are not known, and it is not known if labelling stops in integrated settings.

For social benefits, the authors conclude that it is not possible to state with confidence that students with intellectual disability have benefited socially with their peers without a disability. Many studies have shown improvements in attitudes of regular school students towards students with intellectual disability following structured opportunities for contact. However, that these changes in attitude have influenced behaviour (e.g. friendships) has yet to be demonstrated. For parent participation, Danby and Cullen found that although educational policy in several countries encourages the involvement of parents in educational decision-making, there is little evidence to suggest that parental participation is at an appropriate level, or that schools and teachers demonstrate a willingness to develop collaborative partnerships with parents.

The outcome studies reviewed by Danby and Cullen (1988) are limited. However, they conclude that there is conflicting evidence to support the contention that educational outcomes for integrated students are superior to those of students in segregated settings. Additionally, the authors conclude that there is little evidence to support or to refute the claim that integrating students with intellectual disability into mainstream classes has a detrimental effect on regular students.

In assessing the comparability of the studies, Danby and Cullen found that the characteristics of the subjects are often poorly defined, and that while the physical features of the integrated ability (e.g. duration of integration) are described, the quality of the integration experience is rarely described. A variety of outcome measures has been used, which raises the issue of the validity of these measures (e.g. behaviour rating scales, IQ tests).

Polloway and Smith (1988) evaluated some of the early integration studies in the United States, examining the effectiveness of special class placement versus regular class placement. The results, they conclude, are confusing. They also point out that little research in this area has occurred in the past decade. This may indicate that a given placement option for any group of students may be difficult to defend because such decisions should be made at an individual level.

The importance of appropriate individualised support in integration settings was demonstrated by Center and her colleagues (1991). In a qualitative study of 20 Australian students with physical and/or intellectual disability, the nature of the student's disability did not appear to affect the success of placement provided that appropriate supports were in place. However, in contrast to classes for students with physical disability, the researchers concluded that IM support classes appeared to be less effective classes because they combined larger class sizes with excessive numbers of disruptive children, no aide support and, frequently teachers without specialised training. However, students with intellectual disability who were in support classes were judged to be making reasonable progress, despite the presence of several students with behaviour problems in the class.

How much integration is occurring for students with mild intellectual disability is not clear. In surveying 200 regular class teachers involved in the integration process for these students, Childs (1981) reported that an average of 68% of each student's day was spent in the regular class. However, 62% of teachers said they did not support mainstreaming students with mild intellectual disability. Childs concluded that this reflected the teachers' lack of specialist training, and lack of access to resources and support services.

In reviewing several studies on the integration of students with mild intellectual disability, Leyser et al. (1986) found that only four students integrated into regular classes for

more than 50% of the time. Most students with mild intellectual disability appear to receive little or no integration.

Curriculum and instruction issues

The question of what comprises the optimal educational setting for students with mild intellectual disability is also reflected in discussions about what to teach these students. With regard to curriculum, the dilemma is the choice between mainstreaming students in a non-functional curriculum that may lead to undesirable outcomes, or the provision of a segregated curriculum for a group of students who may already be stigmatised. Further, there is a lack of agreement about the nature of the content within curriculum domains, and a lack of agreement about the relative emphasis that should be placed on each domain (Halpern & Benz, 1987).

Recent support at the early primary school level (e.g. the ESSP program in NSW), has seen the use of regular education programs as much as possible for students with mild intellectual disability. Placement in a segregated class is seen as a last resort at this level. However, by high school, the discrepancy between the performance of students with mild intellectual disability and their peers is such that placement and curriculum options are severely limited.

Reschly (1990) concludes that there is little empirical evidence to guide decision-making in the area of educational programming. The evidence demonstrates that as the discrepancy between this group and their peers in regular classes increases, an alternative curriculum may be required. The degree to which such an alternative curriculum requires a setting different from mainstream placement is at issue. Consequently, placement decisions concerning students with mild intellectual disability beyond the early primary years are currently based on opinion and/or philosophical principles. For example, the principle of the "least restrictive environment" and REI are examples of professional beliefs and trends that have resulted in the placement of students with mild intellectual disability in mainstream settings.

A fundamental question that remains unresolved is the appropriate balance between basic skill instruction and the remainder of the curriculum for these students. This question has been addressed by several authors (Halpern & Benz, 1987, Polloway, Patton, Epstein & Smith, 1989). There is agreement that basic skill instruction may fail in spite of the best instructional efforts, and the energy spent in basic skills instruction may come at the expense of instructional time in community adjustment programs. There is also agreement that a "subsequent environments" approach is useful in programming at both primary and secondary levels (Polloway et al., 1989, Polloway et al., 1991). This approach is also seen as being relevant from a transitions perspective, and projected adult adjustment needs of students with mild intellectual disability have also influenced the provision of school programs. Beyond this there is little agreement as to what constitutes an appropriate curriculum for students with mild intellectual disability.

There is also very little information about the types of curricula that students with mild intellectual disability are being exposed to. Childs' (1981) survey of regular teachers integrating students with mild intellectual disability showed that these students spent approximately two thirds of the school day in regular classes. A different text was used by 40% of these teachers for these students. However, Childs concluded that there was little evidence that these teachers modified their instruction for the integrated students.

An analysis of the programs of 107 primary school students with intellectual disability showed that there was a clear emphasis on academic goals (Epstein et al., 1989). Given the age of the students, this result may not be surprising. However, the authors argued that the absence of social and communication skills, and transition and vocational programs may be of concern given the poor post-school outcomes for many of these students.

The lack of agreement about an appropriate curriculum is not reflected in discussion about effective teaching strategies for students with mild intellectual disability. Two thorough reviews of the literature have identified the critical instructional factors associated with successful outcomes for students with mild disabilities (Christenson, Ysseldyke, & Thurlow,1989; Reith & Evertson, 1988). These factors are also supported by the finding of an evaluation of integration studies by Wang and Baker (1986). The integration programs that produced strong positive effects incorporated instructional features identified in the literature as leading to effective teaching, including continuous assessment, individualised programs, student self-management, peer tutoring, and consultation with other teachers.

Summary and conclusion

The education of students with mild intellectual disability is an important area of Special Education, catering for between 1.4% and 3.0% of the school aged population. Despite this, the area is relatively under-researched, particularly in Australia, and there is a lack of information about how services to students with mild intellectual disability are implemented. The objective of the present study was to describe the provision of specialised services to students with mild intellectual disability in two educational regions of New South Wales. Variables which were of particular interest in the study included the characteristics of the students receiving services, teacher variables, school variables, degree of integration, availability of resources, use of curricula, and teaching strategies.

METHODOLOGY

The Study Objectives

The project aimed to:

1. provide a comprehensive overview of the way in which educational services to students with a mild intellectual disability are provided in two educational regions of N.S.W.;
2. obtain teacher perceptions of factors which contribute to the way in which these services are provided;
3. validate these findings through observation in a sample of classrooms; and
4. develcp a report which would allow teachers to be advised of models and procedures being used by other teachers.

The Target Population

The target population for the study was all teachers of students with mild intellectual disability receiving special education services in the Metropolitan East and Hunter Education Regions of New South Wales. This included teachers of Secondary and Primary classes (IM classes) and Early School Support Program (ESSP) classes, as well as teachers in Schools for Specific Purposes (SSP) catering for students with mild intellectual disability. Part-time and casual teachers were included in the sample. This gave a target population of 110 teachers, 37 in the Hunter and 73 in Metropolitan East.

The Study Design

Following consultations with the Principal Education Officers (Special Education) and groups of teachers in each of the regions it was decided to conduct the study in three stages:

Stage I:	Questionnaires to all IM teachers in both regions
Stage II:	Structured interviews of a stratified random sample of those teachers who responded to the questionnaire in Stage I
Stage III:	Observations of a stratified random sample of those participating in Stage II

Instruments

Three instruments were designed to be used in the study: a questionnaire; an interview schedule; and an observation pro forma.

The questionnaires were designed to provide data on teacher background, curriculum, programming, teacher strategies and those school factors relevant to IM teachers. Four versions of the questionnaire were developed: Primary; Secondary; SSP; and ESSP. The questionnaires covered similar areas, but were varied to cater for the different settings. The interviews covered the same areas as the questionnaires, but gave teachers more opportunity to express particular viewpoints. The classroom observations provided data on classroom climate, lesson structure, classroom management, behaviour management and student independence.

Stage I

approached by members of the research team. The proposed project was outlined and discussed and their cooperation sought.

Stage I began in May 1993 when a package was sent to the principals of all schools in both regions, where there was an IM teacher on staff. This package contained:

- A letter to the principal outlining the purposes and structure of the study and requesting permission to conduct the project in the school.
- A Data Sheet asking for, among other things, the number of IM teachers on staff and the number of Questionnaires actually distributed. A reply-paid envelope was provided for the Data Sheet.
- An envelope for each IM teacher on staff. These were sealed and individually addressed to each teacher and contained an explanatory letter, the questionnaire, an information sheet and envelope and a reply-paid envelope for the questionnaire and information sheet.

While the information sheet asked for the teacher's name, this sheet was separated from the questionnaire upon receipt at the Special Education Centre to assure the anonymity of the teacher. The information sheet allowed the researchers to contact those teachers who did not respond, although its primary purpose was to keep a record of those teachers who completed the questionnaire so that they could be contacted for Stages II and III of the project, if selected. On the questionnaire itself, each teacher was asked to supply a six digit code word, invented by each teacher, so that the questionnaire, interview and observation data could be collated. The interview and observation data were also identified with this code word, so that individual teachers could not be identified at any stage.

In order to enhance the response rate, those teachers and principals who had not responded by the beginning of July were sent a reminder and further copies of the original documents if required. Non-replying principals were subsequently contacted by phone since their written permission was imperative to the continuation of the study.

Stage II

The stratification was based on settings and was proportional to the response rates to the questionnaire by teachers. In September 1993, the 40 teachers who were randomly selected for Stage II were sent an explanatory letter and a sheet to complete and return giving the most suitable interview times and permission to tape record the interview. Twenty-seven teachers agreed to be interviewed. The interviews were to be conducted at the school and if the teachers wished to be interviewed during class time, a qualified casual Special Education teacher was provided for the duration of the interview. Letters were also sent to the principals of the relevant schools to keep them informed and to seek their cooperation with the interview stage of the project. The structured interviews, which were conducted by a trained interviewer who was also a qualified teacher, took between 45 minutes and one hour and 15 minutes.

Stage III

of teachers was selected from those who had been interviewed. One teacher from each setting in each region was randomly selected from those who had been interviewed. This gave a total of seven observations, there being no SSPs for students with a mild intellectual disability in the Hunter Region.

A letter was sent to those teachers selected, and their principals, asking for their cooperation with Stage III of the project. Because of the small number of teachers involved in this stage, the details were finalised either by FAX or phone conversation.

The observations, which were conducted by a trained observer who was also a qualified teacher, took place, where possible, over three consecutive days. The observer completed three Classroom Observation Scales per day, one before recess, one between recess and lunch and one after lunch. Each observation covered a forty minute period with recordings made every five minutes. A Classroom Daily Activity Sheet was also completed each day, covering student and teacher activities as well as resources used in the course of the day.

Copies of all documents are included in Appendix 1.

The Response Rate

The response rates for Stage I are shown in Table 1. Completed questionnaires were received from 68 teachers (33 in the Hunter and 35 in Metropolitan East), giving an overall response rate of 62 per cent. The higher response rate in the Hunter region (89% compared to 48%) was to be expected due to the extensive personal contact between the Special Education Centre staff and the Special Education teachers in the Hunter region. The lowest response rate (30%) was from the SSPs while in both regions, the response rate from the Secondary teachers was greater than for Primary, SSP or ESSP.

Table 1: Response to Questionnaire by Region and Level

	Met. East			Hunter			Total		
	No. Sent	No. Ret.	% Ret.	No. Sent	No. Ret.	% Ret.	No. Sent	No. Ret.	% Ret.
Secondary	18	11	61	16	14	88	34	25	74
Primary	25	13	52	18	16	89	43	29	67
SSP	20	6	30				20	6	30
ESSP	10	5	50	3	3	100	13	8	62
Total	**73**	**35**	**48**	**37**	**33**	**89**	**110**	**68**	**62**

Table 2: Number of Teachers Interviewed by Region and Level and Percent target Population Interviewed

	Met. East			Hunter			Total		
	No. Interviewed	% of Total in Region	No. Observed	No. Interviewed	% of Total in Region	No. Observed	No. Interviewed	% of Total	No. Observed
Secondary	3	17	1	8	50	1	11	32	2
Primary	6	24	1	6	33	1	12	28	2
SSP	2	1	1				2	10	1
ESSP	1	1	1	1	33	1	2	15	2
Total	**12**	**16**	**4**	**15**	**41**	**3**	**27**	**25**	7

Of the 40 teachers who were contacted for Stage II, 27 agreed to be interviewed, 15 in the Hunter and 12 in Metropolitan East. The distribution of these is given in Table 2. Of the total number of IM teachers in the two regions (110), 25% were interviewed, 41% from the Hunter and 16% from Metropolitan East. It should be noted that only those teachers who responded to the questionnaire were eligible to be selected for the interview stage, and of those, some were ineligible due to change of circumstance between the questionnaire and interview stages.

Data Analysis

All questionnaire data, including the open-ended questions, were coded and entered into a computer data file and subsequently analysed. The interviews were replayed and all salient points noted on a separate matrix for each teacher (the teachers had been given an assurance that the interviews would not be transcribed). The interview data were then collated.

The classroom observation data were summarised in a matrix for each class. The questionnaire, interview and observation data were then compared. Data were tabulated where the questions permitted and analysed using basic descriptive techniques including means, standard deviations, t-test and chi-square, where appropriate.

TEACHER AND CLASS VARIABLES

Teacher Age and Teaching Level

The sample consisted of 68 teachers from the Hunter (33) and Metropolitan East (35) regions of the Department of School Education. The distribution of the sample in terms of age and teaching area is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Age and Teaching Area of the Study Sample

Age				Teaching Area		
	N	%			N	%
21-30	9	13		Sec	25	37
31-40	27	40		Prim	29	43
41-50	26	38		SSP	6	9
51-60	6	9		ESSP	8	12

The majority of respondents (56) were employed as class teachers, seven as executive teachers, one as assistant principal and four as advanced skills teachers. Most were in fulltime employment (57) with six part-time, two permanent casuals and three temporary casuals.

Qualifications and Teaching Specialisation

The initial teaching qualifications of the group tended to be at the two year trained and three year trained level, with most involved in later upgrading, as indicated by the initial and current qualifications shown in Table 4.

There was a statistically significant difference in initial qualifications between primary and secondary teachers ($p < .05$) with more secondary teachers having the higher initial qualification of a degree and Diploma in Education (50% vs 15%).

Thirty five of the group (51%) had completed at least the equivalent of one year full time study in special education, with the most frequent year of completion being 1991 and the range being from 1976 to 1993. For the majority of these, the award listed was Diploma in Special Education or Graduate Diploma in Special Education.

While initial teaching experience for the group covered the areas of Early Childhood, Primary and Secondary, the average number of years spent in regular education (6.3) was slightly less than the average number spent in special education (7.5).

Table 4: Initial and Current Highest Qualifications of the Study Group

Initial Qualifications		
	N	%
2 yr Coll.	18	27
3yr Dip. Teach	27	40
Degree & Dip. Ed.	17	25
Other	6	8

Current Highest Qualifications		
	N	%
2 yr Coll.	2	3
3 yr Dip. Teach	17	25
Degree & Dip Ed.	11	16
Grad. Dip	17	25
B. Ed.	12	18
Masters	5	7
Other	3	4

Table 5: First Teaching Specialisation

	First Specialisation	
	N	%
Early Childhood	3	4
Infants	11	16
Primary	15	22
Infants/Primary	19	28
Secondary	20	29

Most teachers had received their IM teaching position through request or advertising (71%), with merit given as the reason by 12%, and default or lack of an alternative identified as the reason by 17% of the sample.

Satisfaction With IM Teaching

A majority of the group (71%) indicated that their present position was their preferred teaching position. Of the 16% who were undecided, 10% stated they would prefer to be teaching a different age level or ability level in special education, while 6% said they would prefer not to be in special education.

The preference among the sample for teaching students with mild intellectual disability was demonstrated by 88 % of respondents stating that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the position, and only 12% indicating dissatisfaction. A further

indication of satisfaction was shown by 57% group indicating they would still want to be teaching IM students in two years and 61% indicating they expected that to happen. Only 12% indicated they did not want to be in the position in two years, with 31% undecided, although these results need to be interpreted with caution, as 38% did not respond and they could be those most likely to be dissatisfied being in special education.

The main reasons given for desiring or expecting to stay in IM teaching included enjoyment and a feeling of making a contribution. Those who were uncertain about remaining mainly identified possible promotion or qualification changes and staffing arrangements as reasons to leave. Parental support and area networks were claimed by 41% to be a significant factor in making teaching easier, with support from the executive and staff also frequently identified (29%). Changes identified which could make the teaching easier included better grouping of classes, more training and inservicing, changes to the curriculum and parental and executive support.

Those dissatisfied with IM teaching identified a number of reasons with relatively equal frequency. These included behaviour problems, lack of resources, composite classes, lack of training, the class being seen as dumping ground for those who could not be integrated, burnout/frustration and children entering high school without appropriate skills.

Nature of student disabilities

The nature of disabilities found in IM classes in this sample went beyond mild intellectual disability, which was the primary disability. Fifty-one percent of teachers stated that they had a child or children in their class with physical disability, 49% had a child/children with sensory impairment, 81% had a child/children with behaviour problems and 72% had a child/children with moderate intellectual disability. The sex distribution of additional disabilities is shown in Table 6, and is compared with the overall distribution of boys and girls. This suggests a slightly higher incidence of behaviour problems in boys than in girls. The overall ratio of boys to girls is 1.66:1.

Table 6: Average number of students identified with specific problems

Problems	Boys	Girls	Total	% Boys	% Girls
Students in class	8.3	5.0	13.3	62.4	37.6
More than one disability	2.1	1.2	3.3	25.3	24.0
Behavioural problems	3.0	0.9	3.9	36.1	18.0
Non English-speaking background	2.2	1.5	3.7	26.5	30.0

Class Size and Teacher Influence on Pupil Placement

The average class size was 13.3 pupils (8.3 males, 5.0 females). This was above the stated desired class size of 11 and the difference between actual and desired size was statistically significant ($p < .01$). Fifty nine percent of the sample stated that they had little or no input into placement of new students in the class. It was also claimed by 47% that either little or only basic information was received about new students.

Despite concern about lack of influence on placement and lack of information about new students, comments about the degree of input into review of existing placements were largely favourable. Eighty nine percent of the sample stated they had either extensive or moderate input into this review, with transfers of students occurring as a result of this review claimed by 62% of teachers to occur, and seldom or never to occur by 38% of teachers. This input into the review process was reflected in teacher judgement of appropriate placement, with an average of 6.9 males per class (class average 8.3) and 4.5 females (class average 4.5) considered suitable for the IM setting. In cases where they were not considered appropriately placed, the most common alternate placements identified were IO (19%) and a Behaviour Unit (11%).

Involvement With Other Classes and With Parents

A majority of the teachers in this survey stated they taught in classes other than IM (53%), with 12% teaching for 3 sessions a week and 35% teaching in other settings for a mean of 3.4 sessions per week. It was also claimed by 25% of the sample that other teachers provided instruction in their classroom for a mean of 3.5 sessions per week. Eighty per cent of the sample stated that other areas of the curriculum were taught by outside teachers, with the average commitment being one session a week.

The level of support provided to students and teachers of students taught outside the IM class, but performing to a similar level as students in the class is shown in Table 7. In general, the level of support for students was considered to be equivalent in fewer than half the cases (40%). The level of support for teachers of these students was also only considered equivalent in approximately 50% of cases.

Table 7: Support provided to students and teachers of students performing at IM level outside the IM class

Students					Teachers			
Claimed Equivalent Support		No. of Students & Hrs Per Week			Claimed Equivalent Support		No. of Teachers & Hrs Per Week	
N	%	N	Hrs Per Week		N	%	N	Hrs Per Week
22	40	3.7	5.1		26	52	3.5	1.9

Although parent involvement was considered to be important or very important by a majority of the sample (97%), actual involvement was not occurring to this level. Only 36% of teachers reported a reasonable degree of interaction with parents, 51% reported low involvement and 12% stated that parents were not involved.

Several questionnaire items sought information about attitudes to integration and integration practice. Teachers were asked to evaluate the degree of support given by various school groups for academic integration, and non-academic integration. No significant differences were found between the two regions in perceived attitudes to integration. Table 8 shows the degree of support for academic integration reported by IM teachers.

Table 8: Degree of support for academic integration, as perceived by IM teachers

Source, perceived by teachers	Supportive/ Very supportive (%)	Tolerated/ Antagonistic (%)
Executives		
Secondary (n=24)	71	29
Primary (n=27)	78	22
SSP (n=5)	80	20
ESSP (n=8)	100	0
Other teachers		
Secondary (n=22)	54	46
Primary (n=26)	69	31
SSP (n=5)	60	40
ESSP (n=8)	100	0
Ancillary		
Secondary (n=23)	91	9
Primary (n=25)	84	16
SSP (n=5)	60	40
ESSP (n=8)	100	0
Parents/community		
Secondary (n=22)	82	18
Primary (n=27)	92	8
SSP (n=5)	40	60
ESSP (n=7)	100	0
IM students		
Secondary (n=24)	58	42
Primary (n=28)	75	25
SSP (n=5)	60	40
ESSP (n=8)	100	0
Other students		
Secondary (n=20)	45	55
Primary (n=26)	69	31
SSP (n=2)	100	0
ESSP (n=8)	100	0
MEAN	77.8	22.2

The degree of support for non-academic integration perceived by IM teachers is shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Degree of support for non-academic integration, as perceived by IM teachers

Support, perceived by teachers	Supportive/ Very supportive (%)	Tolerated/ Antagonistic (%)
Executives		
Secondary (n = 24)	80	20
Primary (n = 29)	97	3
SSP (n = 5)	80	20
ESSP (n = 5)	100	0
Other teachers		
Secondary (n = 23)	74	26
Primary (n = 29)	87	13
SSP (n = 5)	80	20
ESSP (n = 8)	100	0
Ancillary		
Secondary (n = 23)	91	9
Primary (n = 27)	100	0
SSP (n = 5)	60	40
ESSP (n = 8)	100	0
Parents/community		
Secondary (n = 23)	91	9
Primary (n = 28)	100	0
SSP (n = 5)	40	60
ESSP (n = 7)	100	0
IM students		
Secondary (n = 25)	72	28
Primary (n = 28)	96	4
SSP (n = 5)	80	20
ESSP (n = 8)	100	0
Other students		
Secondary (n = 22)	55	45
Primary (n = 27)	89	11
SSP (n = 5)	60	40
ESSP (n = 7)	100	0
MEAN	84.7	15.3

In each category, for both academic and non-academic integration, primary IM teachers and ESSP teachers perceived more support for integration than did secondary IM teachers.

Teachers, except those working in ESSP, were asked what type of planned integration occurred in the school. Results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Planned integration

	Percentage per region identifying planned integration		
	Hunter	Met.East	Mean
Academic	75	96	84*
Social/playground	100	96	98
Extracurricular	88	75	83
Assemblies	100	92	96
Class visits	54	71	62
Sport	100	96	98

*Significant difference between regions, chisq $p < .05$

There were no significant differences on any type of integration, between the various settings (primary, secondary, SSP). Significantly more teachers from Metropolitan East region than Hunter Region stated that planned academic integration occurred. The number of students partly or fully integrated is shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Average number of students partly or fully integrated, per class

	Boys	Girls	Total	% Boys	% Girls
Students in class	8.3	5.0	13.3	62.4	37.6
Partly integrated	4.0	2.2	6.2	48.2	44.0
Fully integrated	0.8	0.7	1.5	9.6	14.0

The number of students partly or fully integrated is shown in Table 11. An average of 6.2 students per class are being at least partly integrated into mainstream classes with 1.5 students on average being fully integrated. The subjects identified as being involved in integration included English/Maths, Science, Languages, Arts, Technology, Personal Development, Health and Physical Education. Eighty per cent of secondary teachers and 89% of primary teachers stated that they had students from their class who were mainstreamed for some subjects.

The main criteria for selecting the regular class teacher to be involved in integration included the needs of the students (48%), willingness to participate and class size. However 27% claimed it related to an available class (especially in smaller schools), or merely a random selection.

During the **observation stage**, notes were made by the observer as to when instances of integration occurred. These are summarised in Table 12.

Table 12: Instances of integration/withdrawal observed in schools

Program Type, Region	Integration Procedures
ESSP, Met East	*Children remained enrolled in mainstream class, went to Resource Room each morning for ESSP. Teacher also provided withdrawal for Year 2 and Primary LD group, and team taught for 30 mins.*
ESSP, Hunter (two schools)	Mainstream enrolment, with children withdrawn from K/1 and Yr 2 for the morning sessions. Three groups from Infants, Junior Primary for literacy development and Reading Recovery Program for senior students (sic).
Primary, Met East	All primary children have optional integration each afternoon. The children ask their integration teacher if they can visit for the afternoon. Infants children had 30 mins integration at midday, and when the primary children go swimming. Yrs 5,6 students had 60 minutes integrated dance practice.
Secondary, Met East	All students are integrated for PE, Sport, Art, Music, Living Skills, Food Technology and Life Studies with their appropriate grade level.
Secondary, Hunter	All students are integrated for Sport, PE, Music, Food Technology. The Year 12 students are integrated into the workforce at TAFE and for community/business work experience.
SSP, Met East	No integration, except for work experience.

Further information on integration issues came from the **interview stage**. Most teachers said that they favoured at least partial integration, but many had doubts about its implementation. For example, at the secondary level, one teacher described academic integration as the impossible pipe dream of theorists. The observation of this teacher was that when students with mild intellectual disability are academically integrated it is into lower achievement classes and the integrated students may respond to and acquire negative behaviours in these classes and/or be demoralised in the process. For adolescent students with mild intellectual disability, the stigma of support class placement was seen as most damaging by several teachers. While the students are perceived to desire acceptance by their peers, the students acknowledge their inability to do the work required in the mainstream. Although functional programs may be seen as more likely to lead to successful outcomes for the student, it was felt by several teachers that some students would rather fail in mainstream classes and be seen as normal, than succeed in a segregated class and not be accepted by their peers.

Issues about integration raised by teachers in interviews tended to fall into two areas: school variables and student variables.

School variables

Some teachers interviewed saw the ability range of the class as a significant variable in mainstreaming. Where a wide ability range and student grouping were already in place, integrating children with mild intellectual disability was seen as less of a problem. However, as classes with low ability groups may already have children with discipline

problems in them, some of the IM teachers felt that these class teachers would see the integration of a child from the IM class as an additional burden.

Several IM teachers raised the issue of whether the class teacher could meet the needs of the integrated child. Teachers needed to be able to program for the child and use appropriate behaviour management techniques. A common issue raised was the need for more integration support and aide time.

School environment and staff attitudes were mentioned by several teachers as variables affecting integration. This often required public relations work by the IM teacher, but support from school executive was also seen as being an important variable here. Several teachers felt that attitudes to integration were better in schools where there was a long history of special classes. IM teachers were fairly evenly divided about whether mainstream teachers had positive or negative attitudes to integration.

Several teachers in the Metropolitan East region commented that their schools had many groups from non English-speaking backgrounds who required special attention, and that integrated children from the IM class were accepted as just another group they would cater for. However, other teachers felt that their colleagues regarded children from the IM class as the sole responsibility of the IM teacher. It was thought that children with behaviour problems were particularly unlikely to be welcomed for mainstreaming.

One secondary school had an inservice program in place that was designed to improve the attitudes of mainstream teachers, and improve their acceptance and coping ability. However, teachers pointed out that it was not sufficient to be accepting, and it was necessary for teachers to be prepared to provide individualised assistance to integrated students.

A barrier to integration for some secondary teachers was the transition education program. These teachers said that if a child was involved in transition education and work experience, timetabling constraints made integration difficult. The teachers said that transition education and work experience should be accorded a higher priority than mainstreaming.

The size of the class was another important variable. Teachers were more reluctant to integrate children if they already had a large class. IM teachers commented that they were hesitant to inflict further burdens on teachers who already had large classes, composite classes or difficult children. The IM teachers also stated that the maximum number of children mainstreamed should be one or two per class. This can be difficult to achieve in a secondary school, where several children may need to be placed in an elective class.

Student variables

The most frequently mentioned student variable mentioned by teachers was ability or functional level. Teachers generally believed that those who had the ability should be mainstreamed. However, several teachers believed that students also needed to have appropriate social skills before being mainstreamed. There was some difference of opinion about this: some teachers saw the development of appropriate social skills as the paramount function of the IM class; others thought that social skills could be learnt only from appropriate role models in a mainstream setting. This was particularly so when the IM class covered a wide age range, leading to a situation where some children had no

same-age role models and little opportunity for age-appropriate friendships. Peer support and integration were seen as possible solutions to this problem.

Many teachers were of the view that the student needed to have a good chance of succeeding at integration. This was important for two reasons: it would be counterproductive for the student to experience failure in a mainstream class; and a poor experience would make mainstream teachers reluctant to accept other children from the IM class.

There were mixed opinions among teachers about the effect mainstreaming had on children's self-esteem, and it is likely that opinions would also vary for each child. One point of view was that many children value normality very highly, and would rather be at the bottom of a regular class than suffer the stigma of special class placement, particularly in secondary schools. The opposite viewpoint was that children can achieve and lead in an IM class and are in a comfort zone where they feel safe and able to succeed. There was general agreement that children with extreme behavioural or emotional problems, or children at the bottom end of the IM range, were very difficult to integrate.

Possible models of integration

Several teachers recommended the extension of the ESSP model into primary and secondary settings. This would involve placing children in mainstream classes with support from the IM teacher, either within the class or in withdrawal mode. At least one secondary IM teacher expressed the view that many children were in her class because of a deficiency in one area, mainly literacy. She felt that a better model would be for the children to be mainstreamed, but withdrawn for specific help with literacy skills. Some teachers in Metropolitan East region thought that the main need was for language support, particularly ESL, and that ESL support should be provided in IM classes.

One model being implemented in at least two primary schools was for the IM class to operate until lunchtime and for the students to move into age-appropriate mainstream classes for non-academic subjects in the afternoon.

SUPPORT: PROFESSIONAL AND PRACTICAL

Formal support services

Two of the questionnaire items asked teachers how much access they had to various support services and how much access they would like to have. For all services the mean current access score was lower than the mean preferred access score and in two cases these means were found to be significantly different, using *t* - tests. Overall, the teachers had significantly less access to the services than they would have preferred ($p<.01$). The scores for individual services are shown in Table 13.

From the interviews, it became apparent that there is confusion among IM teachers as to what services they are entitled to receive. There are also variations in availability of services both between regions and within regions. Access to ISTB, STLD and ESL support appears to depend, in many instances, on whether the school has a policy that these services should be available to the IM class. However, even having a policy does not necessarily mean availability. Services are so overloaded that teachers feel it is acceptable to have a request met a term after the initial request was made. Several teachers said that

they do not bother with services because by the time the request is met, the child is out of the class.

Table 13: Difference between current and preferred access to support services, as perceived by IM teachers

SERVICE	EXISTING*	PREFERRED	p (E - P)	NUMBER RESPONDING
School counsellor	2.9	3.6	NS	67
Support teacher	2.1	3.1	NS	62
Teacher's Aide	2.7	3.7	NS	67
Therapy services	1.3	3.0	<.01	66
Specialist facilities	1.4	3.0	<.01	60
Volunteers	1.9	3.1	NS	62
Itinerant services	1.8	3.1	NS	35
Other	1.8	2.8	NS	12

*1 = none; 4 = extensive

From the interviews, it would appear that Speech pathologists, occupational therapists and physiotherapists are in very short supply. If teachers have any access to these services it is very slow. Satisfactory access to many support services seems to depend on the efforts/experience of the IM teacher, counsellor and executive.

With regard to **school counsellors,** seven of the teachers interviewed were pleased with the counsellor both in terms of quantity and quality of assistance received, but the remainder needed far more counsellor time. Counsellors are generally at each school one day per week. With a whole school to cater for, there is very little time for extra help for IM students. Teachers expressed a need for help in dealing with personal and emotional problems in children. Several secondary teachers mentioned the need for additional counsellor time because of what they stated to be the "relatively high" incidence of sexual assault among girls in IM classes.

Surprisingly, the situation regarding availability of various services is not much better in the SSPs. For example, one SSP teacher asked: "Why are children placed in special classes then denied special help?"

Many teachers believe that certain services are not, in theory, available to the IM class. Services mentioned in this regard include STLD, ISTB, ESL and some types of therapy. Several teachers said that the policy appeared to be that by putting a child in an IM class, the IM teacher will be able to meet all his/her needs. However IM teachers believe they are not trained to deal with the range of problems they encounter. For example, this survey showed that 49% of IM teachers do not have qualifications in Special Education. In Disadvantaged Schools Program (DSP) schools, teachers are also expected to deal with home problems which spill over into the classroom. While this also applies to mainstream

classes, at least one teacher said that a lot of out-of-school problems seem to be blamed on the IM students. It was felt that dealing with these problems required the skills of a counsellor or community liaison officer. One Metropolitan East school had the services of a community liaison officer for a short time and found this to be advantageous.

Informal types of school support

Among the informal supports mentioned by interviewed teachers were the head teacher, principal, other teachers in the Special Education unit, the IM Association and other teachers. Teachers also mentioned current university courses and co-students, "grandmas" who come in for reading, the wider community, parents, ex-students, work experience employers, sporting agencies as sources of support.

Personnel resources

There are regional differences in the allocation of aide time. There appears to be no aide time allotted to IM classes in the Hunter, whereas in Metropolitan East, each teacher has some aide time. On average, this appeared to be one day per week. The need for aide time was raised more than any other resource issue. Of the teachers interviewed, only one did not feel that an aide would be an advantage. Aides are utilised in group work, making and organising resources, reading, excursions, when working on individual programs, for larger classes (e.g. 18), for younger children who are incontinent, travel training etc. Teachers felt that there is inequity in the allocation of aide time. For example, a class of 8 students with hearing impairments has a full time aide but an IM class of 18 may have no aide time at all. Teachers felt that aides need to be trained and sensitive to the special needs of IM students.

A view expressed by several teachers was that if integration is to be encouraged by the Department of School Education, then it must be accompanied by more aide time, as the mainstream teacher must have support.

Professional development support

Some teachers who were interviewed felt that there is a lack of professional development support. Fourteen of the 26 teachers interviewed felt that professional development support was adequate, 10 felt it was inadequate and 2 were ambivalent. Apart from time and money (global budgeting) constraints, the main problem appears to be that what is offered is not suitable at a personal level. This stems from the fact that IM covers such a broad range of skill levels, disabilities, ages and settings that it is almost impossible to cater for all needs. Courses are considered to be either too general (e.g. cover from infants to secondary), or too specific (e.g. based on special schools philosophy). There were a few common areas where teachers would like more professional development. These included behaviour management, policy changes, curriculum issues, and resources. However, the general feeling was that what is needed and would be most useful is a *forum for sharing*: a setting where IM teachers could meet to share and discuss problems and "spread around the knowledge".

Many teachers felt that they were professionally isolated. This need is partly met by IM associations, but may need to be addressed at a systems level. Most teachers wanted someone who understands the IM situation to discuss their problems with. Teachers of isolated IM classes do not have this opportunity and while several had a supportive

executive, the supervisor rarely had Special Education training or experience. The need for a Special Education Consultant was suggested as a possible solution to professional isolation.

Material resources

Twelve of the teachers interviewed were unhappy with the level of resources available. They said that they need access to more varied material so that work can be presented repeatedly but differently. Some concerns included: age appropriate books are difficult to obtain; primary programs are inappropriate for secondary students and there is a need for maths books which contain fewer written instructions. According to several teachers, problems have arisen when IM classes are set up with no funding, or before funding becomes available. One teacher expressed the view that the resources are too fragmented; that there does not appear to be a direction or overall picture.

The remaining 14 teachers were happy with the level of material resources they had, or to which they had access. This is in part a function of how long the class has existed and how long the current teacher has had the class, as well as the teacher's access to general school resources. Most of the satisfied teachers still had specific unmet requirements (e.g. carpet, computers, age appropriate materials, resources for living skills), even though they were generally happy. More expensive items are better catered for in a unit, where costs of larger items such as washing machines, can be shared. Some teachers have been able to go outside the school for funding and have sought community support.

CURRICULUM AND PROGRAMMING

CURRICULUM

Survey Results

Teachers used a wide variety of curricula for their students, with most teachers using several curricula. The most frequently used were school-based curricula (87% of the sample), school-based curricula utilising the key learning areas (80%), activity-based curricula (71%), and activity-based curricula using the key learning areas (74%).

NSW Board of Studies curricula were used by 58% of the teachers. For these teachers, the English, Maths and Science curricula were used as often as other approved Board of Studies curricula. However, at least 74% of teachers adapted both groups of curricula to meet the needs of their students. For specialist teachers who taught the students, the Board of Studies curricula for Maths, English and Science were always adapted. The most frequent reason given for not using Board of Studies curricula with their students was that these did not meet the individual needs of the students in their class.

Ninety-two per cent of teachers rated the curricula that they used with their students as being either effective or very effective. However, 85% of teachers believed that there should be a specific curriculum for students with mild intellectual disability. There was no general agreement as to how the content of this curriculum should be organised. It was just as likely that teachers believed that the content should be organised on the key learning areas, functional areas, individual needs, or a combination of these methods. This lack of agreement was reflected in how comprehensive teachers believed the content of a separate curriculum should be. Thirty-eight per cent of teachers felt the content should be very comprehensive, 32% believed there should be ideas for school-based development only, and 17% thought there should be only broad topics.

Interview Results

During interviews, four of twenty-seven teachers stated that the curricula they were using did not meet the needs of their students. In two of these cases this was because the teachers were new to the school and were still getting to know the needs of their students. One of these teachers felt that the social and emotional needs of the students were greater than their academic needs, and consequently, these needs were not met by mainstream curricula. The third teacher did not feel that she had the theoretical knowledge to develop appropriate curricula for students with mild intellectual disability. The fourth teacher felt that because the students in her class were exempt from the basic skills testing conducted in primary school classes in NSW, there was no reliable way of easily assessing them, and so the present curriculum was not meeting their needs.

The remaining teachers interviewed believed that the needs of their students were being met because their programs were individualised, they were based on likely post-school outcomes (e.g. work experience), or they were reassured by assessments by the school counsellor. However, one of these teachers claimed that until there are special education guidelines for the education of students with mild intellectual disability, then these students will not be taken seriously by the school and the wider community.

PROGRAMMING

Over half of the sample surveyed (56%) programmed for their students either 1-4 or 5-10 weeks ahead. Sixteen per cent programmed more than a term ahead. In most cases (58%), these programs were supervised by non-special education trained school staff, and programs were usually supervised either once a term (37%), or twice a year (38%). However, four teachers (6%) said that their programs were never supervised.

Thirty-eight percent of respondents did not feel that the programming support they received was adequate. At least 80% of this group requested inservice or feedback on their programs. Also requested by this group was information about what other IM teachers were doing in the area of programming. There was no significance between who supervised IM teachers' programs and how adequate these teachers perceived programming support to be.

The perceived competence of IM teachers to program in a variety of areas is shown in Table 14. Teachers' responses to this item were collapsed from four categories into two: "competent" or "limited skills". A large proportion of surveyed teachers regarded themselves as competent to program in most areas. The exceptions were vocational skills (43% limited skills) and creative arts (72% limited skills). For vocational skills, fewer secondary teachers (24%) reported limited skills than primary teachers (52%). For creative arts, primary and secondary teachers believed their skills were limited.

Table 14: IM teachers perceived competence to program in a variety of curriculum areas as a percentage of the sample

Curriculum area	Competent	Limited skills
Numeracy skills	88	12
Basic reading instruction	89	11
Extension of basic literacy skills	85	15
Social skills	87	13
Vocational skills	57	43
Writing	89	11
Personal development	79	21
Creative arts	28	72
Social and leisure skills	81	19

If the IM teacher's students were integrated into mainstream classes, collaboration between the IM and the regular class teacher was more likely to occur for assessment (51% of the sample) and evaluation of the students' programs (47%), than for writing the program (18%) or for deciding program content (29%). Regular class teachers most commonly assumed responsibility for deciding program content (59%), writing the program (60%), or for collating the program resources (52%). The most common area that IM teachers assumed responsibility for in mainstreaming was follow-up procedures of the student (35%), although, this was just as likely to be addressed collaboratively (37%).

There were some differences between the primary and secondary teachers on the question of those responsibilities for mainstreaming. For example, no secondary teachers assumed responsibility alone for assessment, program content, writing the program, collating the resources, and for evaluation. Responsibility for these areas lay with either the regular class teacher or with both teachers collaboratively. In contrast, between 16% and 35% of primary teachers assumed sole responsibility for these areas.

In relation to program collaboration with agencies associated with the Department of School Education, 59% of the secondary and SSP teachers were involved with the Transition Education Program and 38% with TAFE. Involvement with Skill Share (23%) and "Staying On" (16%) was also mentioned by these IM teachers.

Table 15 shows the type of records kept by the IM teacher for individual students, class groups and the IM class. Anecdotal records and test results were most frequently used in all situations.

Table 15: Types of records kept by IM teachers as a percentage of the survey sample

	Anecdotal	Test results	Ongoing graphs	Checklists	Formal reports	Student self-monitoring	Samples of work	Miss-ing
Individual student	54	18	2	13	3	2	6	2
Group	32	15	0	22	0	3	15	13
Class	28	24	0	8	10	0	18	12

Responses to the frequency of communication on student progress used with parents were collapsed into each term, less than once a term, and not used categories. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 16. Informal social contact and telephone conversations were the most common and frequent types of communication with parents. Communication books, inserts in the school report and student contracts were the least likely forms of communication to be used.

Additional forms of instructional support for students in the IM classroom were also used. Peer tutoring by students in the IM class (86% of the sample), volunteers (39%), parent tutors (39%), team teaching (35%), and peer tutoring by students from other classes (35%) were most commonly used.

Table 16: Type and frequency of communication on student progress used with parents, as a percentage of the survey sample

	At least once a term	Less than once a term	Do not use
Contracts	20	16	64
Standard school reports	8	84	8
Interviews	23	75	2
Special class reports	10	29	61
Informal social contact	65	17	18
Insert in school report	6	33	65
Telephone conversation	52	28	20
Communication book	37	1	62

Sixty-four per cent of teachers felt that the programs offered at their school met their students' needs either effectively or very effectively. Positive factors identified by IM teachers associated with the needs of these students being met were: the effective co-ordination of school-based programs and collaboration by those implementing these programs (e.g. transition education programs), the delivery of programs that ensure students' success and the development of their self-esteem.

Factors identified by teachers that may detract from the needs of their students being met were very varied. However, one theme that emerged from teachers' responses was the importance of the co-ordination of both school and community-based services for the students. This was associated with the lack of a clear agreement on the nature of an appropriate program for students with mild intellectual disability and confusion concerning the most appropriate means of support for these students.

TEACHING STRATEGIES AND MANAGEMENT

Teaching strategies

Within the questionnaire, teachers were asked to identify the teaching strategies they employed to teach specific curriculum areas. The possible strategies included data-based instruction, individualised, small group and whole class instruction, cooperative learning and thinking/planning skills. The data were not analysed by individual strategies. Other issues raised in the context of student variables related to the need to meet the learning styles and interests of students with widely different ability, behaviour and expectation levels.

During the classroom observation period, a trained teacher observed three lessons per day for three days, using a series of recording instruments including a Classroom Observation Scale (COS) and the Classroom Daily Activity Sheets (see Appendix).

The COS provides a measure of the operation of the classroom through direct observation of specific classroom practices. The scale is divided into five sections: Classroom Climate, Structure, Classroom Management, Behaviour Management and Independence. Each of these sections is further divided in subsections with specific practice statements.

Observations of the classroom occurs for a period of five minutes followed by two minutes of recording in which the observer records whether a specific practice was present in the observation period. A total of six 5 minute observations periods were undertaken in each lesson, with three observations periods per day across three days. Results were averaged for the total number of observations in each setting to permit comparison of data (see Table 17).

Table 17: Observations of classroom climate and classroom management*

Program Type, Region	Classroom Climate		Classroom Management	
	Positive Actions	Negative Actions	Positive Actions	Negative Actions
ESSP Met East	15%	16%	51%	4%
ESSP Hunter	10%	20%	44%	5%
Pri Met East	10%	19%	40%	6%
Pri Hunter	19%	20%	44%	14%
Sec Met East	24%	13%	40%	1%
Sec Hunter	13%	18%	39%	5%
SSP Met East	16%	20%	53%	3%

* Shown as a percentage of possible responses by observation periods.

The classroom climate (Table 17) would appear to reflect a relative balance of both positive and negative actions within the classrooms. However when the subsections of classroom climate are analysed a different picture emerges. As shown in Table 18, in practice, teachers place a strong emphasis on students working individually with minimum focus on interacting with other students. Such observations are reflected in the teaching strategies observed in classrooms.

Table 18: Observations of classroom co-operation*

Program Type, Region	Positive Co-operation Actions	Negative Co-operation Actions
ESSP Met East	6%	28%
ESSP Hunter	3%	28%
Pri Met East	4%	25%
Pri Hunter	4%	22%
Sec Met East	4%	27%
Sec Hunter	8%	25%
SSP Met East	4%	26%

* Shown as a percentage of possible responses by observation periods.

Within the classroom observations phase, secondary teachers were observed using a variety of teaching strategies including small group instruction and individual programs with teacher aide withdrawal of a small group of students, although one room focussed more on whole class activities throughout the day. Team teaching occurred when outside personnel were talking to students (eg. CES personnel). In both situations, periods of non-instruction occurred in each room, usually for computer games or 'fun' afternoon activities. Peer tutoring was not common although it was used in one room for sight word skills. Data-based instruction was not used. While there was a focus on cooperative learning, it was not observed in teaching practices. Teaching of thinking and problem solving skills was also not in evidence.

Within the primary classrooms, the teachers were observed to use individual instruction for reading or English tasks. Whole class instruction was used at the beginning of each activity and for all afternoon activities such as art and craft. In one class, students were expected to work independently on tasks and seek teacher assistance when required. News and class discussion were commonly used with teacher participation restricted to support and showing interest. There was no evidence of peer tutoring, data-based instruction or thinking and problem-solving skills instruction.

The ESSP settings focussed on team teaching through small group instruction of specific academic skills following whole class or group introduction of the topic. Small group instruction was also used to teach questioning skills, understanding of teacher instructions and cooperative learning strategies. Individual instruction was used by one teacher to cover reading skills, while another teacher monitored class teacher instruction of academic

skills.

The SSP class teacher was observed to use individu
took a small group herself and the teacher's aid
instruction was commonly used throughout the d
activities based on cooperative learning. Some afte
video involved no direct teacher instruction.

The teaching materials used in each situation reflecte
teacher made materials and equipment borrowed
Some examples are shown in Table 19.

Behaviour management

The initial questionnaire asked teachers to indic
strategies they used frequently with their students. T
which reports the number and frequency of usage o
Among the "other" strategies mentioned were: org
sport/craft/computer time; praise; involvement in the
and, involvement in school and community work
predominated for the total sample, with the use of ind
used frequently by greater than 50% of teachers (52%

While there were no significant differences betwe
differences between the frequency of specific s
secondary teachers (ESSP and SSP were exclu
Secondary teachers were more likely to use contra
were more likely to use early marks ($p<.05$) and clas
consistent with management approaches found in reg

Table 19: Teaching material in the classrooms

Secondary	Primary	ESSP	SSP
worksheets for living skills and reading	books for teacher to read	reading books for individual and teacher directed reading	worksheets for reading and spelling
newspapers	activity sheets	worksheets to make into a book	exercise books for tables
activity cards	computer paper for writing, draft	activity sheets for phonics, maths, word families, phrase reading and punctuation, tracing, spelling	bingo for traffic signs and safety words
science and sport equipment	activity sheets for maths, word building and matching	word sheets	tape deck
computer games	wooden blocks for building	phonic games	drawing paper for free time
flashcards, bingo games	job sheets	memory games	video and TV
optional reading for	tape deck and tapes for songs and stories to act out	flash cards for sight words	class photo album
cash books and withdrawal slips for banking exercises	plastic money	printer to write down	activity sheets for spelling and reading
blackboard for class exercises	activity books for colouring in		flash cards for sight words and numbers
	dog for reins		phonic letters for making words
	computer and other games for free time		communication cards
	Eureka worksheets		play money
	craft materials box		
	homework sheets		

Table 20: Use of specific behaviour management strategies by IM teachers as reported in the initial questionnaire

	never		occasionally		frequently	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
contracts	22	40	22	44	9	16
loss of privileges	8	15	37	69	13	24
'time out' in class	11	18	33	53	18	29
'time out' out of class	20	31	29	45	15	23
daily marks	38	71	12	23	3	6
behaviour	21	39	16	29	17	32
class points	24	36	10	15	26	40
individual points	15	24	15	24	32	52
free time	8	9	25	44	21	47
class excursions	15	24	25	47	16	29
others (please specify)	1	7	1	7	12	87

The findings also show that the attitude of students IM class teachers display on behaviour management does affect how they perceive it. Some of the behaviour management that are a large amount of time they make them feel that it has made on their class teacher. In order for the they have the attitude control factors of behaviour and experience in the beginning of each year, and teachers that students are more likely to misbehave and be off task. As more and different activity in the behaviour management factors, the opinions on the operation of behaviour management programs in the classroom of the classes. Comparison tables to the total implementation of times, the number of students particularly better who are identified by teachers as having behaviour problems, the reasons for placing students in IM classes, the size of the class and age and ability range of the students.

Reasons given by teachers for having to spend little time on behaviour management included: careful selection of students for the class, including not placing academically disturbed children in the class; the use of self-motivating programs; strong whole class management strategies; and rewards at individual and whole class levels.

Where behaviour management problems occurred, these were often due to disruptive students and the problems were eased when the student left the room. The arrival of a new student in the class required more emphasis on the use of behaviour management strategies until the student settled in.

The strategies and problems outlined in the questionnaire responses and structured interviews were reinforced in the classroom observations (phase). Most teachers were

observed to have strong classroom control using positive management techniques such as expecting students to follow class rules, using praise and responding consistently to discipline problems (see Table 11). The occasional use of time out of class was observed in 6 of the 7 classes. Behaviour management strategies observed in the primary classroom included ignoring inappropriate behaviours while encouraging the appropriate behaviours of students, using responsibility for their behaviour, the teacher managing the environment by having the student move later to quietly discuss the problem and look for a solution.

A major problem not addressed in either the questionnaire or the structured interview, but observed in the classroom observations, related to the application of behaviour management strategies when the class teacher was absent. In one classroom, the stable behaviour of students when the IM class teacher was present contrasted sharply with the behaviour disturbances that occurred when the casual teacher took the class.

Summary and Conclusions

This report has described a comprehensive, three-stage study of services to students with mild intellectual disability in two educational regions of New South Wales: Hunter and Metropolitan East. The study included only those students who had been identified as having a mild intellectual disability, and were receiving special education services. It is likely that the majority of children with mild intellectual disability are fully mainstreamed in regular classes, with the remaining approximately 40% of the population of such students receiving special education (Doherty, 1982). For example, in this study, it appeared that special education services were being provided to approximately 492 students (37 positions x 13.3 students) in Hunter Region. This represents 0.59% of the school population in the region. If the prevalence rate of 1.39% suggested by Andrews et al.,(1979) is accepted, this would give a service rate of 42%, in line with Doherty's figures. If the rate of 3% suggested by Ashby et al. (1988) is used, the service rate drops to 20%. In other words, 58-80% of students with mild intellectual disability are mainstreamed. Mainstreamed students could be receiving other special education services such as from a Support Teacher (Learning Difficulties).

This study was, therefore, of services provided to those children who, for whatever reason, had been identified as needing special education services, and were receiving those services in a special school, special class or unit or through an Early School Support Program.

The study consisted of a questionnaire which was sent to all teachers working in programs for students with mild intellectual disability (IM teachers) in Department of School Education facilities in two regions. The second stage was an individual interview of a sample of teachers responding to Stage 1, subdivided into ESSP, Primary, Secondary and SSP. Stage 3 involved observations in the classrooms of a sample of the teachers from Stage 2 in each of the four sub-categories.

The main findings of the research are summarised at the beginning of this report. In terms of possible directions for future planning, these findings include:

1. Recommendation by some teachers of a model of integration which extended the ESSP model into primary and secondary settings, with the IM teacher acting as a support to mainstreamed students with mild intellectual disability.

2. A wish by most teachers for more access than they were receiving to support services, particularly to therapy services and specialist facilities, as well as to ISTB, STLD and ESL services.

3. A perceived need for more teachers' aide time, particularly in Hunter Region, where there appeared to be little or no allocation of teacher aide time for IM classes.

4. A need for Teachers' Aides (Special) to receive training.

5. An expressed wish by most IM teachers for a specific curriculum for students with mild intellectual disability.

6. An expressed wish by most IM teachers for inservice training and feedback on their programming.

REFERENCES

Andrews, R.J., Elkins, J., Berry, P.B., & Burge, J.A. (1979). A survey of special education in Australia. Canberra: Schools Commission.

Ashby, G.F., Robinson, N.M., & Taylor, A.J. (1988). The special education service element of the Commonwealth Special Education Program: A review. A report for the Department of Employment, Education and Training. Kelvin Grove, Qld: Brisbane College of Advanced Education.

Center, Y., & Curry, C. (1993). A feasability study of a full integration model developed for a group of students classified as mildly intellectually disabled. International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 40, 3, 217-235.

Center, Y., Ward, J., Ferguson, C., Conway, R., & Linfoot, K. (1991). Integration of children with physical and intellectual disabilities into support (special) classes attached to regular schools. In A.F. Ashman (Ed.), Current themes in integration, (pp. 37-60). University of Queensland: Fred & Eleanor Schonell Special Education Research Centre.

Childs, R.E. (1981). Perceptions of mainstreaming by regular classroom teachers who teach mainstreamed educable mentally retarded students in the public schools. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 16, 3, 225-227.

Christenson, S.L., Ysseldyke, J.E., & Thurlow, M.L. (1989). Critical instructional factors for students with mild handicaps: An integrative review. Remedial and Special Education, 10, 5, 21-31.

Danby, J. & Cullen, C. (1988). Integration and mainstreaming: a review of the efficacy of mainstreaming and integration for mentally handicapped pupils. Educational Psychology, 8, 3, 177-195.

Davis, W.E. (1990). Contemporary forces and factors affecting students with mild mental retardation. Paper presented at the annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA, August, 1990.

Doherty, P. (1982). Strategies and initiatives for special education in NSW. Sydney: NSW Department of Education.

Edgar, E. (1987). Secondary programs in special education: Are many of them justifiable? Exceptional Children, 53, 6, 555-561.

Epstein, M.H., Polloway, E.A., Patton, J.R., & Foley, R. (1989). Mild retardation: Student characteristics and services. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 24, 1, 7-16.

Halpern, A.S. & Benz, M.R. (1987). A statewide examination of secondary special education for students with mild disabilities: Implications for the high school curriculum. Exceptional Children, 54, 2, 122-129.

Polloway, E.A., Patton, J.R., Smith, J.D., & Roderique, T.W. (1991). Issues in program design for elementary students with mild retardation: Emphasis on curriculum development. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 26, 2, 142-150

Polloway, E.A., Patton, J.R., Epstein, M.H., & Smith, T.E.C. (1989). Comprehensive curriculum for students with mild handicaps. Focus on Exceptional Children, 21, 8, 1-12.

Polloway, E.A. & Smith, J.D. (1988). Current status of the mild mental retardation construct: Identification, placement and programs. In M.C. Wang, M.C. Reynolds, & H.R. Walberg (Eds.), Handbook of special education research and practice: Volume 2. Mildly handicapped conditions, (pp. 7-22). Oxford: Permagon.

Polloway, E.A., Epstein, M.H., Patton, J.R., Cullinan, D., & Luebke, J. (1986). Demographic, social and behavioural characteristics of students with educable mental retardation. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 21, 1, 27-34.

Polloway, E.A., Epstein, M.H., & Cullinan, D. (1985). Prevalence of behaviour problems among educable mentally retarded students. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 20, 1, 3-13.

Reith, H. & Evertson, C. (1988). Variables related to the effective instruction of difficult to teach children. Focus on Exceptional Children, 20, 5, 1-8.

Reschly, D.J. (1990). Mild mental retardation: Persistent themes, changing dynamics, and future prospects. In M.C. Wang, M.C. Reynolds, & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), Special education: Research and practice, (pp.81-99). Oxford: Permagon Press.

Wang, M.C. & Baker, E.T. (1986). Mainstreaming programs: Design features and effects. Journal of Special Education, 4, 503-521.

APPENDIX

ESSP survey form

SSP survey form

Primary survey form

Secondary survey form

Structured interview schedule

Classroom Observation Scale

Daily activities sheet

Weekly summary sheet

University of Newcastle
Special Education Centre
Survey Form: ESSP

Services to students with a mild intellectual disability

This survey form asks you a number of questions about the provision of your services to students with a mild intellectual disability. Unless otherwise specified, you should answer all questions in relation to the students that you have educational responsibility for.

Note: please ignore the numbers to the right of the response boxes - they are for coding purposes only.

If you need assistance to complete this form or if you require any additional information please contact:

A/Prof. Phil Foreman	(049) 21 6292
Dr Robert Conway	(049) 21 6273
Mr Ian Dempsey	(049) 21 6282
Mrs Hedy Fairbairn	(049) 21 6278

In the boxes below, please include an identifying code of six letters and/or numbers e.g your car number plate (AJC345), a birthday (010469), your middle name (KARENE) or any other 'word' that is meaningful to you. Please make a note of the code for future reference.

Your code: ☐☐☐☐☐☐

Part A: TEACHER VARIABLES

1. What is your current employment position?

Tick one box

teacher	☐ 1
executive teacher	☐ 2
deputy principal	☐ 3
assistant principal	☐ 4
principal	☐ 5
other e.g AST (please specify)	☐ 6

.....

2. What is your current employment status?

Tick one box

full-time	☐ 1
part-time	☐ 2
permanent casual	☐ 3
temporary casual	☐ 4

Appendix

3. If casual, why is the position not permanently filled?

.....

.....

4. What is your gender?

Tick one box

male	☐ 1
female	☐ 2

5. What is your age?

Tick one box

21 - 30 years	☐ 1
31 - 40 years	☐ 2
41 - 50 years	☐ 3
51 - 60 years	☐ 4
60+ years	☐ 5

6. What was your initial teaching qualification?

Tick one box

2 year college	☐ 1
3 year Dip Teach	☐ 2
Degree and Dip Ed	☐ 3
other (please specify)	☐ 4

.....

7. What is your highest current educational qualification?

Tick one box

2 year college	☐ 1
3 year Dip Teach	☐ 2
Degree and Dip Ed	☐ 3
Grad Dip	☐ 4
B.Ed.	☐ 5
Masters	☐ 6
other (please specify)	☐ 7

.....

8a). What was your first teaching specialisation?

Tick one box

- Early childhood ☐1
- Infants ☐2
- Primary ☐3
- Infants/primary ☐4
- Secondary ☐5

8b). If you answered "secondary" in the last question, please indicate your area of specialisation.

.....

9a). Have you completed at least the equivalent of 1 year full-time study in special education?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

9b). If you answered "yes" in the previous question, please indicate the award and the year of completion of your course/s.

Award.....Year19.....

Award.....Year19.....

10. Please indicate your years of teaching experience in the following settings.

Write the number of years

	Regular Education	Special Education
Early childhood		
Infants		
Primary		
Secondary		
other (please specify)		

11a). Is your current position as an ESSP teacher your preferred teaching position?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2
- undecided ☐3

11b). If you answered "no" or "undecided" in the previous question, what is your preferred teaching position?

.....

Appendix

12. **Indicate how satisfied you are with your position as an ESSP teacher.**

Tick one box

- very satisfied ☐1
- satisfied ☐2
- not satisfied ☐3
- very dissatisfied ☐4

13. **If you are not satisfied with your position as an ESSP teacher, please explain why.**

.....

.....

14. **Indicate why you were appointed to your current teaching position (e.g. on request, lack of alternative).**

.....

.....

15a). Do you **want** to be in an ESSP teaching position in 2 years time?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2
- undecided ☐3

15b) **Please comment on your response to the above question.**

.....

.....

16a). Are you **likely** to be in an ESSP teaching position in 2 years time?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2
- don't know ☐3

16b). Please comment on your response to the above question.

.....

.....

17. **What factors have made your role as an ESSP teacher easier?**

.....

.....

18. **What factors have made your role as an ESSP teacher more difficult?**

.....

.....

19. **What changes would you like to make/to be made, to help you in your role as an ESSP teacher?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

20. **For the students for whom you have responsibility, please indicate the number of:**

Write a number in the appropriate boxes

	Boys	Girls
total students in your target group		
students with more than one disability		
students with behaviour problems		
students who are partly integrated into mainstream classes		
students from a non-English speaking background		
students who are fully integrated into mainstream classes		

21. **Apart from mild intellectual disability, do any children in your class have any of the following disabilities?**

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
physical	☐1	☐2
sensory	☐1	☐2
behavioural	☐1	☐2
moderate intellectual	☐1	☐2

22. **What is the optimal number of children for whom you should have responsibility?**

Write a number in the box

☐

23. How much input do you have about the placement of new students in your program?

Tick one box

extensive	☐ 1
moderate	☐ 2
little	☐ 3
none	☐ 4

24. What information do you receive about new students entering your program (e.g. age, previous experience, level of performance)?

.....

.....

25. Of the children in your care, how many would you say are appropriately placed in the ESSP?

Write a number in each box

Boy	Girls
☐	☐

26. If you consider some children are not appropriately placed in the ESSP please comment as to why you feel this way.

.....

.....

.....

.....

27. How much input do you have in review of student placements?

Tick one box

extensive	☐ 1
moderate	☐ 2
little	☐ 3
none	☐ 4

28. To what extent does the review of student placements lead to a withdrawal from the program if the student is no longer appropriately placed in the ESSP?

Tick one box

always	☐ 1
often	☐ 2
seldom	☐ 3
never	☐ 4

29a). Do you have teaching responsibilities other than the ESSP?

Tick one box

yes ☐1

no ☐2

29b). If so, what are these responsibilities?

.....

.....

30. How frequently do you use the following?

Tick one box per row

	very frequently	frequently	occasionally	never
teacher consultation				
team teaching				
small group instruction within classroom				
one-on-one instruction within classroom				
withdrawal				

31. How important do you consider parental involvement is in the ESSP?

Tick one box

very important ☐1

important ☐2

of little importance ☐3

unimportant ☐4

32. How would you describe the involvement level of the parents of the children currently in your program?

Tick one box

highly involved ☐1

involved ☐2

low involvement ☐3

uninvolved ☐4

33. How much access do you have to the following support services/staff in your school?

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher (learning difficulties)				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

34. How much access **would you like to have** to the following?

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher (learning difficulties)				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

Part B: SCHOOL VARIABLES

35a). How accepted do you feel as a full member of staff at the centres/schools at which you work?

Tick one box

fully accepted	☐ 1
reasonably accepted	☐ 2
tolerated	☐ 3
rejected	☐ 4

35b). Please comment on your response to the previous question.

.....

.....

.....

.....

36a). In your present teaching situation, do you feel comfortable with the equity, in relation to other teachers, of:

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No	NA
Playground duty roster			
Teaching hours roster			
Release time			
Allocation of resources			
Allocation of room/s			
Bus supervision			
other (please specify)			

36b). If you answered "no" to any of the above please elaborate.

.....

.....

.....

.....

37. How supportive of the academic integration of the children in your program do you consider the following groups to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your ESSP students				
Other students				

38. How supportive of the **non academic** of the children in your program do you consider the following groups to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your ESSP students				
Other students				

Part C: CURRICULUM VARIABLES

As there is no Board of Studies curriculum specifically for students with mild intellectual disability, we are interested in establishing what curriculums are being used by teachers and how effective ESSP teachers think such curriculums are. Please answer these questions in relation to students with a mild intellectual disability.

39. Please indicate if you use the following curriculum/s.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Board of Studies Curriculum	☐1	☐2
School based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Activity based	☐1	☐2
Activity based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Special Unit based	☐1	☐2
Special Unit based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Don't use a curriculum	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

40. For each of the curriculums listed below, indicate the way in which you use it.

Tick one box per row

Name of curriculum	I use the curriculum as is	I adapt the curriculum	I do not use it at all
Numeracy skills			
Basic trading instruction			
Extension of basic literacy skills			
Social skills			
Vocational skills			
Writing			
Personal development			
Creative arts			
Social and leisure skills			

41. If you do not use curriculum/s developed by the Board of Studies, please explain why you prefer to use an alternative or do not use a curriculum.

.....

.....

.....

.....

42. How would you rate the effectiveness of the curriculum/s that you use?

Tick one box

- very effective ☐1
- effective ☐2
- ineffective ☐3
- very ineffective ☐4
- don't use a curriculum ☐5

43a). Would you like to change the curriculum/s you use?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2
- don't use a curriculum ☐3

43b). If you would like to change the curriculum/s you use, **what** would you like to change?

.....

.....

.....

.....

43c) If you would like to change the curriculum/s you use, **how** would you like to change it?

.....

.....

.....

.....

44a). Should there be a specific curriculum for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2

44b). If "yes", indicate whether the following should be responsible for its development.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
IM teachers	☐ 1	☐ 2
Special Education teachers in other schools	☐ 1	☐ 2
School Executive (Special Education)	☐ 1	☐ 2
School Executive (non Special Education)	☐ 1	☐ 2
parents	☐ 1	☐ 2
students	☐ 1	☐ 2
Regional Dept. of School Ed. (Special Education)	☐ 1	☐ 2
Special Education Directorate	☐ 1	☐ 2

45a). Should there be a separate primary curriculum for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2

45b). If "yes" how should the content be organised?

Tick one box

- Key Learning Areas ☐1
- Functional areas ☐2
- Individual needs ☐3
- other (please specify) ☐4

.....

45c). If there should be a separate primary curriculum how comprehensive should the content and scope of this curriculum be?

Tick one box

- very comprehensive ☐1
- broad topics only ☐2
- ideas for school-based development ☐3
- other (please specify) ☐4

.....

Part D: PROGRAMMING VARIABLES

46. What is your usual pattern of programming?

Tick one box

- < 1 week ahead ☐1
- 1-4 weeks ahead ☐2
- 5-10 weeks ahead ☐3
- > 1 term ahead ☐4
- retrospectively ☐5
- fixed program ☐6
- other (please specify) ☐7

.....

47. Who supervises your program?

Tick one box

- School Executive (Special Education) ☐1
- School Executive (non Special Education) ☐2
- other (please specify) ☐3

.....

Appendix

48. How often is your program supervised?

Tick one box

- never ☐1
- every week ☐2
- every 1-4 weeks ☐3
- every 5-10 weeks ☐4
- about twice a year ☐5
- annually ☐6
- other (please specify) ☐7

.....

49a). Do you consider the programming support you receive to be adequate?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

49b). If "no", indicate whether you require the following types of further support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	*No*
inservice	☐1	☐2
feedback on programs	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

50. How competent do you feel to program in the following areas?

Tick one box per row

	very competent	competent	limited skills	not competent
Numeracy skills				
Basic reading instruction				
Extension on basic literacy skills				
Social skills				
Vocational skills				
Writing				
Personal development				
Creative arts				
Social and leisure skills				

51. For the following curriculum areas indicate if you prepare written individual, group and/or class programs.

Tick the appropriate box/es in each row

	Written programs	Group programs	Class programs	Not applicable
Numeracy Skills				
Basic Reading Instruction				
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills				
Social Skills				
Vocational Skills				
Writing				
Personal Development				
Creative Arts				
Social and Leisure Skills				

52. Which teaching strategies do you use in the following areas?

Tick the appropriate box/es in each row

	data-based instruction	Individual-ised instruction	small group instruction	whole class instruction	thinking/ planning skills	Co-operative learning	other - please specify
Numeracy Skills							
Basic Reading Instruction							
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills							
Social Skills							
Vocational Skills							
Writing							
Personal Development							
Creative Arts							
Social and Leisure Skills							

53. Who takes overall responsibility for the following areas?

Tick one box per row

	ESSP teacher	Regular class teacher	Collaboratively	Not applicable
Assessment				
Program content				
Writing the program				
Collation of resources				
Evaluation				
Follow-up procedures				

Appendix

54. When assessing for individual students, do you **regularly** use the following?

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Student profiles	☐1	☐2
On-going assessments	☐1	☐2
Formal assessments	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

55. Please indicate the **most frequent** types of records you keep in the following situations.

Tick the most appropriate box in each row

	anecdotal	test results	on-going graphs	checklists	formal reports	student self-monitoring	samples of work
individual student							
group							
class							

56. Do you make contact with parents in the following ways?

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
direct	☐1	☐2
via classroom teacher	☐1	☐2
via school counsellor	☐1	☐2
via principal	☐1	☐2

57. Please indicate how often you use the following means to communicate on student progress with parents.

Tick one box per row

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Each term	Twice a year	Annually	Do not use
Contracts							
Standard school reports							
Interviews							
Special class reports							
Informal social contact							
Insert in standard school report							
Telephone conversation							
Communication book							

58. How often do you use the following behaviour management strategies for your students?

Tick one box per row

	never	occasionally	frequently
contracts			
loss of privileges			
'time out' in class			
'time out' out of class			
early mark			
tokens			
class points			
individual points			
free time			
class excursions			
other (please specify)			

59. Please indicate if you use the following methods of student support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	*No*
Peer tutoring (by students in same class)	☐1	☐2
Peer tutoring (by students from another class)	☐1	☐2
Parent tutoring	☐1	☐2
Team teaching (e.g. with class teacher)	☐1	☐2
Withdrawal (e.g. by other staff)	☐1	☐2
Volunteer workers and organisations	☐1	☐2

60a). How well are your students' needs met by the programs you offer?

Tick one box

very effectively	☐1
effectively	☐2
to some extent	☐3
not at all	☐4

60b). **Please comment on your above answer.**

.....

.....

.....

61. *Are there any other comments you would like to make?*

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your interest, time and patience

Please complete the identifying sheet and place it in the envelope marked 'identifying sheet', then place the survey form and the identifying sheet envelope in the reply paid envelope and mail within two weeks. The identifying sheet and survey form will be separated by a research assistant immediately on receipt.

University of Newcastle
Special Education Centre
Survey Form: SSP

Services to students with a mild intellectual disability

This survey form asks you a number of questions about the provision of your services to students with a mild intellectual disability. Unless otherwise specified, you should answer all questions in relation to the students that you have educational responsibility for.

Note: please ignore the numbers to the right of the response boxes - they are for coding purposes only.

If you need assistance to complete this form or if you require any additional information please contact:

[illegible]

In the boxes below, please include an identifying code of six letters and/or numbers e.g. your six digit phone (not 345), a birthday (010269), your middle name (PAUL) or any other word that is meaningful to you. Please make a note of the code for future reference.

Your code:

☐☐☐☐☐☐

Part A: TEACHER VARIABLES

1. What is your current employment position?

	Tick one box
teacher	☐ 1
executive teacher	☐ 2
deputy principal	☐ 3
assistant principal	☐ 4
principal	☐ 5
other e.g. RST (please specify)	☐ 6

.....

2. What is your current employment status?

	Tick one box
full time	☐ 1
part time	☐ 2
permanent casual	☐ 3
temporary casual	☐ 4

Appendix

3. **If casual, why is the position not permanently filled?**

.....

.....

4. **What is your gender?**

Tick one box

- male ☐
- female ☐

5. *What is your age?*

Tick one box

- 20 - 30 years ☐
- 31 - 40 years ☐
- 41 - 50 years ☐
- 51 - 60 years ☐
- 60 + years ☐

6. What was your initial teaching qualification?

Tick one box

- 3 year college ☐
- 3 year Dip Teach ☐
- Degree and Dip Ed ☐
- other (please specify) ☐

.....

7. *What is your highest current educational qualification?*

Tick one box

- 2 year college ☐
- 3 year Dip Teach ☐
- Degree and Dip Ed ☐
- Grad Dip ☐
- B Ed ☐
- Masters ☐
- other (please specify) ☐

.....

8a). **What was your first teaching specialisation?**

Tick one box

Early childhood	☐1
Infants	☐2
Primary	☐3
Infants/primary	☐4
Secondary	☐5

8b). **If you answered "secondary" in the last question, please indicate your area of specialisation.**

.....

9a). **Have you completed at least the equivalent of 1 year full-time study in special education?**

Tick one box

yes	☐1
no	☐2

9b). **If you answered "yes" in the previous question, please indicate the award and the year of completion of your course/s.**

Award..... Year19.....

Award..... Year19.....

10. **Please indicate your years of teaching experience in the following settings:**

Write the number of years

	Regular Education	Special Education
early childhood		
infants		
Primary		
Secondary		
other (please specify)		

.....

11a). **Is your current position or an offer (earlier your preferred teaching position?**

Tick one box

yes	☐1
no	☐2
undecided	☐3

11b). **If you answered "no" or "undecided" in the previous question, what is your preferred teaching position?**

.....

Appendix

12. Indicate how satisfied you are with your position as an SSP teacher.

Tick one box

very satisfied	☐ 1
satisfied	☐ 2
not satisfied	☐ 3
very dissatisfied	☐ 4

13. If you are not satisfied with your position as an SSP teacher, please explain why.

.....

.....

14. Indicate why you were appointed to your current teaching position (e.g. on request, lack of alternative).

.....

.....

15a). Do you **want** to be in an SSP teaching position in 2 years time?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2
undecided	☐ 3

15b) Please comment on your response to the above question.

.....

.....

16a). Are you **likely** to be in an SSP teaching position in 2 years time?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2
don't know	☐ 3

16b). Please comment on your response to the above question.

.....

.....

17. **What factors have made your role as an SSP teacher easier?**

.....

.....

18. **What factors have made your role as an SSP teacher more difficult?**

.....

.....

19. **What changes would you like to make/to be made, to help you in your role as an SSP teacher?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

20. **For your class, please indicate the number of:**

Write a number in the appropriate boxes

	Boys	Girls
Students in your class		
Students with more than one disability		
Students with behaviour problems		
Students who are partly integrated into mainstream classes		
Students from a non-English speaking background		
Students who are fully integrated into mainstream classes		

21. **Apart from mild intellectual disability, do any children in your class have any of the following disabilities?**

Tick one box per row

	Yes	*No*
physical	☐1	☐2
sensory	☐1	☐2
behavioural	☐1	☐2
moderate intellectual	☐1	☐2

22. **What do you believe should be the optimal number of students for your class?**

Write a number in the box

☐

Appendix

23. How much input do you have about the placement of new students in your class?

Tick one box

- extensive ☐ 1
- moderate ☐ 2
- little ☐ 3
- none ☐ 4

24. What information do you receive about new students entering your class (e.g. age, previous performance, level of functioning)?

.....

.....

25. Of the students in your class, how many would you say are appropriately placed in an SSP setting?

Write a number in each box

Boys	Girls
☐	☐

26. If your students are not appropriately placed in the SSP class, please comment as to why you feel this way.

.....

.....

.....

.....

27. How much input do you have in the review of student placements?

Tick one box

- extensive ☐ 1
- moderate ☐ 2
- little ☐ 3
- none ☐ 4

28. To what extent does the review of student placements lead to a transfer if the student is no longer appropriately placed in a class for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

- always ☐ 1
- often ☐ 2
- seldom ☐ 3
- never ☐ 4

29. Do you teach classes other than your own?

Tick one box

yes	☐1
no	☐2

30. What specialist subjects are taught by other teachers to your class (e.g. craft - 1 hour per week).

Complete the boxes as appropriate

Subject	Hours/week

31. How important do you consider parental involvement is for children in an SSP class?

Tick one box

very important	☐1
important	☐2
of some importance	☐3
unimportant	☐4

32. How would you describe the involvement level of parents of the children currently in your SSP class?

Tick one box

highly involved	☐1
involved	☐2
low involvement	☐3
uninvolved	☐4

33a). How much access **do you have** to the following support services/staff in your school?

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

33b). How much access **would you like to have** to the following?

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

Part B: SCHOOL VARIABLES

34a). How accepted do you feel as a full member of staff?

Tick one box

- fully accepted ☐ 1
- reasonably accepted ☐ 2
- tolerated ☐ 3
- rejected ☐ 4

34b). Please comment on your response to the previous question.

.....

.....

.....

.....

35a). In your present teaching situation, do you feel comfortable with the equity, in relation to other teachers, of:

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No	NA
Playground duty roster			
Teaching hours roster			
Release time			
Allocation of resources			
Allocation of room(s)			
Bus supervision			
other (please specify)			

35b). If you answered "no" to any of the above please elaborate.

.....

.....

.....

36a). Does integration of your SSP students occur in other schools?

Tick one box

yes ☐

no ☐

36b). If "yes", do the following types of integration occur?

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Academic	☐1	☐2
Social/playground	☐1	☐2
Extra-curricular	☐1	☐2
Assemblies	☐1	☐2
Class visits	☐1	☐2
Sport	☐1	☐2
Reverse integration	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

Appendix

37. How supportive of **academic** integration of students with a mild intellectual disability do you consider the following groups in your school to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your SSP students				
Other students				

38. How supportive of **non-academic** integration of students with a mild intellectual disability do you consider the following groups in your school to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your SSP students				
Other students				

Part C: CURRICULUM VARIABLES

As there is no curriculum specifically for students with a mild intellectual disability that has been endorsed by the Board of Studies, we are interested in establishing what curriculums are being used by teachers and how effective IM teachers think such curriculums are.

39. Please indicate if you use the following curriculum/s.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
School based	☐1	☐2
School based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Activity based	☐1	☐2
Activity based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Class based	☐1	☐2
Class plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

40. Please list the curriculum/s that you use and describe the way in which you use it.

Complete and tick the boxes as appropriate

	Name of curriculum and specific year levels used	I use the curriculum as is	I adapt the curriculum

41. Where you do not use a curriculum developed by the Board of Studies, please explain why you prefer to use an alternative.

.....

.....

.....

.....

42. How would you rate the effectiveness of the curriculum/s that you use?

Tick one box

very effective ☐1

effective ☐2

ineffective ☐3

very ineffective ☐4

43a). Should there be a specific curriculum for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

yes ☐1

no ☐2

Appendix

43b). If "yes", indicate whether the following should be responsible for its development.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
IM teachers	☐1	☐2
Special Education teachers in other schools	☐1	☐2
School Executive (Special Education)	☐1	☐2
School Executive (non Special Education)	☐1	☐2
parents	☐1	☐2
students	☐1	☐2
Regional Dept. of School Ed. (Special Education)	☐1	☐2
Special Education Directorate	☐1	☐2

43c). If "yes", how should the content be organised?

Tick one box

- Key Learning Areas ☐1
- Functional Areas ☐2
- Individual needs ☐3
- other (please specify) ☐4

.....

43d) If "yes", how comprehensive should the content and scope of this curriculum be?

Tick one box

- very comprehensive ☐1
- broad topics only ☐2
- ideas for school-based development ☐3
- other (please specify) ☐4

.....

Part D: PROGRAMMING VARIABLES

44. What is your usual pattern of programming?

Tick one box

- never ☐1
- every week ☐2
- every 1-4 weeks ☐3
- every 5-10 weeks ☐4
- > 1 term ahead ☐5
- annually ☐6
- other (please specify) ☐7

.....

45. Who supervises your program?

Tick one box

- School Executive (Special Education) ☐1
- School Executive (non Special Education) ☐2
- other (please specify) ☐3

.....

46. How often is your program supervised?

Tick one box

- never ☐1
- every week ☐2
- every 1-4 weeks ☐3
- every 5-10 weeks ☐4
- about twice a year ☐5
- annually ☐6
- other (please specify) ☐7

.....

47a). Do you consider the programming support you receive to be adequate?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

47b). If "no", indicate whether you require the following types of further support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	*No*
inservice	☐1	☐2
feedback on programs	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

Numeracy Skills				
Basic Reading Instruction				
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills				
Social Skills				
Vocational Skills				
Writing				
Personal Development				
Creative Arts				
Social and Leisure Skills				

49. **For the following curriculum areas indicate if you prepare written individual, group and/or class programs.**

Tick the appropriate box/es in each row

	Written programs	Group programs	Class programs	Not applicable
Numeracy Skills				
Basic Reading Instruction				
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills				
Social Skills				
Vocational Skills				
Writing				
Personal Development				
Creative Arts				
Social and Leisure Skills				

Numeracy Skills							
Basic Reading Instruction							
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills							
Social Skills							
Vocational Skills							
Writing							
Personal Development							
Creative Arts							
Social and Leisure Skills							

51. If your students are integrated, who takes responsibility for:

Tick one box per row

	SSP teacher	Regular class teacher	Collaboratively	Not applicable
Assessment				
Program content				
Writing the program				
Collation of resources				
Evaluation				
Follow up procedures				

52. Please indicate if you are involved in the following collaborative programs.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
"Staying On"	☐1	☐2
Transition Education	☐1	☐2
Joint Schools-TAFE	☐1	☐2
Skill Share	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

[redacted]

.....

.....

.....

54. When assessing for individual students, do you **regularly** use the following?

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Student profiles	☐1	☐2
On-going assessments	☐1	☐2
Formal assessments	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

55. Please indicate the **most frequent** types of records you keep in the following teaching situations.

Tick one box per row

	anecdotal	test results	on-going graphs	checklists	formal reports	student self-monitoring	samples of work
individual student							
group							
class							

56. Please indicate how often you use the following means to communicate on student progress with parents.

Tick the most appropriate box in each row

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Each term	Twice a year	Annually
Contracts						
Standard school reports						
Interviews						
Special class reports						
Informal social contact						
Insert in standard school report						
Telephone conversation						
Communication book						

anagement strategies for your students?

Tick one box per row

	never	occasionally	frequently
[illegible]			
loss of privileges			
'time out' in class			
'time out' out of class			
early mark			
tokens			
class points			
individual points			
free time			
class excursions			
other (please specify)			

58. Please indicate if you use the following methods of student support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Peer tutoring (by students in your own class)	☐1	☐2
Peer tutoring (by students from another class)	☐1	☐2
Parent tutoring in school	☐1	☐2
Team teaching (e.g. with support teacher)	☐1	☐2
Withdrawal (e.g. by support teacher)	☐1	☐2
Volunteer workers and organisations	☐1	☐2

59a). How well are your students' needs being met by the programs offered at your school?

Tick one box

very effectively	☐1
effectively	☐2
to some extent	☐3
not at all	☐4

59b). Please comment on your above answer.

.....

.....

.....

60. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your interest, time and patience

Please complete the identifying sheet and place it in the envelope marked 'Identifying Sheet', then place the survey form and the identifying sheet envelope in the reply paid envelope and mail within two weeks. The identifying sheet and survey form will be separated by a research assistant immediately on receipt.

University of Newcastle
Special Education Centre
Survey Form: Primary

Services to students with a mild intellectual disability

This survey form asks you a number of questions about the provision of your services to students with a mild intellectual disability. Unless otherwise specified, you should answer all questions in relation to the students that you have educational responsibility for.

Note: please ignore the numbers to the right of the response boxes - they are for coding purposes only.

If you need assistance to complete this form or if you require any additional information please contact:

A/Prof. Phil Foreman	(049) 21 6292
Dr Robert Conway	(049) 21 6273
Mr Ian Dempsey	(049) 21 6282
Mrs Hedy Fairbairn	(049) 21 6278

In the boxes below, please include an identifying code of six letters and/or numbers e.g your car number plate (AJC345), a birthday (010469), your middle name (KARENE) or any other 'word' that is meaningful to you. Please make a note of the code for future reference.

Your code: ☐☐☐☐☐☐

Part A: TEACHER VARIABLES

1. What is your current employment position?

Tick one box

- teacher ☐1
- executive teacher ☐2
- deputy principal ☐3
- assistant principal ☐4
- principal ☐5
- other e.g AST (please specify) ☐6

.....

2. What is your current employment status?

Tick one box

- full-time ☐1
- part-time ☐2
- permanent casual ☐3
- temporary casual ☐4

Appendix

3. If casual, why is the position not permanently filled?

.....

.....

4. What is your gender?

Tick one box

- male ☐ 1
- female ☐ 2

5. What is your age?

Tick one box

- 21 - 30 years ☐ 1
- 31 - 40 years ☐ 2
- 41 - 50 years ☐ 3
- 51 - 60 years ☐ 4
- 60+ years ☐ 5

6. What was your initial teaching qualification?

Tick one box

- 2 year college ☐ 1
- 3 year Dip Teach ☐ 2
- degree and Dip Ed ☐ 3
- other (please specify) ☐ 4

.....

7. What is your highest current educational qualification?

Tick one box

- 2 year college ☐ 1
- 3 year Dip Teach ☐ 2
- degree and Dip Ed ☐ 3
- Grad Dip ☐ 4
- B.Ed. ☐ 5
- Masters ☐ 6
- other (please specify) ☐ 7

.....

8a). What was your first teaching specialisation?

Tick one box

Early childhood	☐ 1
Infants	☐ 2
Primary	☐ 3
Infants/primary	☐ 4
Secondary	☐ 5

8b). If you answered "secondary" in the last question, please indicate your area of specialisation.

.....

9a). Have you completed at least the equivalent of 1 year full-time study in special education?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2

9b). If you answered "yes" in the previous question, please indicate the award and the year of completion of your course/s.

Award.....Year19.....

Award.....Year19.....

10. Please indicate your years of teaching experience in the following settings.

Write the number of years

	Regular Education	Special Education
Early Childhood		
Infants		
Primary		
Secondary		
Other (specify)		

.....

11a). Is your current position as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability your preferred teaching position?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2
undecided	☐ 3

11b). If you answered "no" or "undecided" in the previous question, what is your preferred teaching position?

.....

Appendix

12. **Indicate how satisfied you are with your position as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability.**

Tick one box

very satisfied	☐ 1
satisfied	☐ 2
not satisfied	☐ 3
very dissatisfied	☐ 4

13. **If you are not satisfied with your position as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability, please explain why.**

.....

.....

14. **Indicate why you were appointed to your current teaching position (e.g. on request, lack of alternative).**

.....

.....

15a). Do you **want** to be in a position teaching students with a mild intellectual disability in 2 years time?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2
undecided	☐ 3

15b). **Please comment on your response to the above question.**

.....

.....

16a). Are you **likely** to be in a position teaching students with a mild intellectual disability in 2 years time?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2
don't know	☐ 3

16b). **Please comment on your response to the above question.**

.....

.....

17. What factors have made your role as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability easier?

.....

.....

18. What factors have made your role as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability more difficult?

.....

.....

19. What changes would you like to make/to be made, to help you in your role as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability?

.....

.....

.....

20. For your class, please indicate the number of:

Write a number in the appropriate boxes

	Boys	Girls
students in your class		
students with more than one disability		
students with behaviour problems		
students who are partly integrated into mainstream classes		
students from a non-English speaking background		
students who are fully integrated into mainstream classes		

21. If your students are partly or fully integrated into mainstream classes, what are the subjects involved?

.....

.....

22. If your students are partly or fully integrated into mainstream classes, how is the regular class teacher selected?

.....

.....

Appendix

23. **Apart from mild intellectual disability, do any children in your class have any of the following disabilities?**

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
physical	☐ 1	☐ 2
sensory	☐ 1	☐ 2
behavioural	☐ 1	☐ 2
moderate intellectual	☐ 1	☐ 2

24. **What do you believe should be the optimal number of students for your class?**

Write a number in the box

☐

25. **How much input do you have about the placement of new students in your class?**

Tick one box

extensive	☐ 1
moderate	☐ 2
little	☐ 3
none	☐ 4

26. **What information do you receive about new students entering your class (*e.g. age, previous* performance, level of functioning)?**

.....

.....

27. **Of the students in your class, how many would you say are appropriately placed in a setting for students with a mild intellectual disability?**

Write a number in each box

Boys	Girls
☐	☐

28. **If your students are not appropriately placed in the class for students with a mild intellectual disability, please comment as to why you feel this way.**

.....

.....

.....

.....

29. How much input do you have in the review of student placements?

Tick one box

extensive	☐ 1
moderate	☐ 2
little	☐ 3
none	☐ 4

30. To what extent does the review of student placements lead to a transfer if the student is no longer appropriately placed in a class for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

always	☐ 1
often	☐ 2
seldom	☐ 3
never	☐ 4

31. Do you teach subjects to classes other than your IM class?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2

32. If you teach subjects to mainstream classes, which of the following applies:

Tick one box

I team teach	☐ 1
I take my IM students with me	☐ 2
I do not take my IM students with me	☐ 3

33. If you teach subjects to other classes, what are these subjects and how many hours per week do you teach them?

Complete the boxes as appropriate

Subject	Hours/week

34. What specialist subjects are taught by other teachers to your class (e.g. craft - 1 hour per week).

Complete the boxes as appropriate

Subject	Hours/week

Appendix

35a). Do you provide support to **students** in other classes who are performing at a level similar to the students in your IM class?

Tick one box

yes ☐1

no ☐2

35b). If "yes",

how many students ☐

total hours per week ☐

36a). Do you provide support to **teachers/s** of students in other classes who are performing at a level similar to students in your IM class?

Tick one box

yes ☐1

no ☐2

36b). If "yes",

how many teachers ☐

how many hours per week ☐

37. How important do you consider parental involvement is for primary children in an IM class?

Tick one box

very important ☐1

important ☐2

of some importance ☐3

unimportant ☐4

38. How would you describe the involvement level of parents of the children currently in your IM class?

Tick one box

highly involved ☐1

involved ☐2

low involvement ☐3

uninvolved ☐4

39a). *How much access* ***do you have*** *to the following support services/staff in your school?*

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher (learning difficulties)				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

39b). *How much access* ***would you like to have*** *to the following?*

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher (learning difficulties)				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

Appendix

Part B: SCHOOL VARIABLES

40a). How accepted do you feel as a full member of staff?

Tick one box

- fully accepted ☐1
- reasonably accepted ☐2
- tolerated ☐3
- rejected ☐4

40b). Please comment on your response to the previous question.

.....

.....

.....

41a). In your present teaching situation, do you feel comfortable with the equity, in relation to other teachers, of:

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No	NA
playground duty roster			
teaching hours roster			
release time			
allocation of resources			
allocation of room/s			
bus supervision			
other (please specify)			

41b). If you answered "no" to any of the above please elaborate.

.....

.....

.....

42a). Do you consider that the physical location of your base classroom within the school is appropriate?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

42b). Please comment on your response to the previous question.

.....

.....

.....

43. Please select one of the following to describe the location of your class.

Tick one box

main building	☐1
portable	☐2
moves or changes location	☐3
other (please specify)	☐4

.....

44. If planned integration occurs in your school, do the following types of integration occur?

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Academic	☐1	☐2
Social/playground	☐1	☐2
Extra-curricular	☐1	☐2
Assemblies	☐1	☐2
Class visits	☐1	☐2
Sport	☐1	☐2
Other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

45. How supportive of **academic** integration of students with a mild intellectual disability do you consider the following groups in your school to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your IM students				
Other students				

Appendix

46. How supportive of **non-academic** integration of students with a mild intellectual disability do you consider the following groups in your school to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your IM students				
Other students				

Part C: CURRICULUM VARIABLES

As there is no Board of Studies curriculum specifically for students with a mild intellectual disability, we are interested in establishing what curriculums are being used by teachers and how effective IM teachers think such curriculums are.

47. Please indicate if you use the following curriculum/s.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Board of Studies curriculum	☐1	☐2
School based	☐1	☐2
School based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Activity based	☐1	☐2
Activity based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Special Unit based	☐1	☐2
Special Unit based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

48. Please list the Board of Studies curriculum/s (if any) that you use and describe the way in which you use it.

Complete and tick the boxes as appropriate

Name of curriculum and specific year levels used	I use the curriculum as is	I adapt the curriculum

49. Please indicate the use of Board of studies curriculum/s (if any) by specialist teachers who teach your class.

Complete and tick the boxes as appropriate

Name of curriculum and specific year levels used	They use the curriculum as is	They adapt the curriculum

50. For teaching areas where you do not use curriculum developed by the Board of Studies, please explain why you prefer to use an alternative.

.....

.....

.....

.....

51. How would you rate the effectiveness of the curriculum/s that you use?

Tick one box

- very effective ☐1
- effective ☐2
- ineffective ☐3
- very ineffective ☐4

52a). Should there be a specific curriculum for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

Appendix

52b). If "yes", indicate whether the following should be responsible for its development.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
IM teachers	☐1	☐2
Special Education teachers in other schools	☐1	☐2
School Executive (Special Education)	☐1	☐2
School Executive (non Special Education)	☐1	☐2
parents	☐1	☐2
students	☐1	☐2
Regional Dept. of School Ed. (Special Education)	☐1	☐2
Special Education Directorate	☐1	☐2

53a). Should there be a separate primary curriculum for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

yes	☐1
no	☐2

53b). If "yes" how should the content be organised?

Tick one box

Key Learning Areas	☐1
Functional Areas	☐2
Individual needs	☐3
other (please specify)	☐4

.....

53c). If there should be a separate primary curriculum how comprehensive should the content and scope of this curriculum be?

Tick one box

very comprehensive	☐1
broad topics only	☐2
ideas for school-based development	☐3
other (please specify)	☐4

.....

Part D: PROGRAMMING VARIABLES

54. What is your usual pattern of programming?

Tick one box

- < 1 week ahead ☐1
- 1-4 weeks ahead ☐2
- 5-10 weeks ahead ☐3
- > 1 term ahead ☐4
- retrospectively ☐5
- fixed program ☐6
- other (specify) ☐7

.....

55. Who supervises your program?

Tick one box

- School Executive (Special Education) ☐1
- School Executive (non Special Education) ☐2
- other (please specify) ☐3

.....

56. How often is your program supervised?

Tick one box

- never ☐1
- every week ☐2
- every 1-4 weeks ☐3
- every 5-10 weeks ☐4
- about twice a year ☐5
- annually ☐6
- other (please specify) ☐7

.....

57a). Do you consider the programming support you receive to be adequate?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

Appendix

57b). If "no", indicate whether your require the following further types of support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	*No*
inservice	☐ 1	☐ 2
feedback on programs	☐ 1	☐ 2
other (please specify)	☐ 1	☐ 2

.....

58. How competent do you feel to program in the following areas?

Tick one box per row

	very competent	competent	limited skills	not competent
Numeracy Skills				
Basic Reading Instruction				
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills				
Social Skills				
Vocational Skills				
Writing				
Personal Development				
Creative Arts				
Social and Leisure Skills				

59. For the following curriculum areas indicate if you prepare written individual, group and/or class programs.

Tick the appropriate box/es in each row

	Written programs	Group programs	Class programs	Not applicable
Numeracy Skills				
Basic Reading Instruction				
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills				
Social Skills				
Vocational Skills				
Writing				
Personal Development				
Creative Arts				
Social and Leisure Skills				

60. **Which teaching strategies do you use in the following areas?**

Tick the appropriate boxes in each row

	Data-based instruction	Individualised instruction	Small group instruction	Whole class instruction	Other - please specify
Numeracy Skills					
Basic Reading Instruction					
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills					
Social Skills					
Vocational Skills					
Writing					
Personal Development					
Creative Arts					
Social and Leisure Skills					

61. **If your students are integrated into mainstream classes who generally takes responsibility for:**

Tick one box per row

	IM teacher	Regular class teacher	Collaboratively	Not applicable
Assessment				
Program content				
Writing the program				
Collation of resources				
Evaluation				
Follow-up procedures				

62. **If you and your students are involved in any collaborative program outside the Department of School Education (e.g. Scouts, voluntary work), please specify.**

.....

63. **When programming for individual students, do you regularly use the following?**

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Student profiles	☐1	☐2
On-going assessments	☐1	☐2
Formal assessments	☐1	☐2
other	☐1	☐2

Appendix

64. **Please indicate the most frequent types of records you keep in the following teaching situations.**

Tick one box per row

	anecdotal	test results	on-going graphs	checklists	formal reports	student self-monitoring	samples of work
individual student							
group							
class							

65. **Please indicate how often you use the following means to communicate on student progress with parents.**

Tick the most appropriate box in each row

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Each term	Twice a year	Annually	Do not use
Contracts							
Standard school reports							
Interviews							
Special class reports							
Informal social contact							
Insert in standard school report							
Telephone conversation							
Communication book							

66. **How often do you use the following behaviour management strategies for your students?**

Tick one box per row

	never	occasionally	frequently
contracts			
loss of privileges			
'time out' in class			
'time out' out of class			
early mark			
tokens			
class points			
individual points			
free time			
class excursions			
other (please specify)			

67. Please indicate if you use the following methods of student support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Peer tutoring (by students in your own class)	☐1	☐2
Peer tutoring (by students from another class)	☐1	☐2
Parent tutoring in school	☐1	☐2
Team teaching (e.g. with support teacher)	☐1	☐2
Withdrawal (e.g. by support teacher)	☐1	☐2
Volunteer workers and organisations	☐1	☐2

68a). How well are your students' needs being met by the programs offered at your school?

Tick one box

very effectively	☐1
effectively	☐2
somewhat effectively	☐3
not at all	☐4

68b). Please comment on your above answer.

.....

.....

.....

69. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your interest, time and patience

Please complete the identifying sheet and place it in the envelope marked 'Identifying Sheet', then place the survey form and the identifying sheet envelope in the reply paid envelope and mail within two weeks. The identifying sheet and survey form will be separated by a research assistant immediately on receipt.

University of Newcastle
Special Education Centre
Survey Form: Secondary

Services to students with a mild intellectual disability

This survey form asks you a number of questions about the provision of your services to students with a mild intellectual disability. Unless otherwise specified, you should answer all questions in relation to the students that you have educational responsibility for.

Note: please ignore the numbers to the right of the response boxes - they are for coding purposes only

If you need assistance to complete this form or if you require any additional information please contact:

A/Prof. Phil Foreman	(049) 21 6292
Dr Robert Conway	(049) 21 6273
Mr Ian Dempsey	(049) 21 6282
Mrs Hedy Fairbairn	(049) 21 6278

In the boxes below, please include an identifying code of six letters and/or numbers e.g your car number plate (AJC345), a birthday (010469), your middle name (KARENE) or any other 'word' that is meaningful to you. Please make a note of the code for future reference.

Your code: ☐☐☐☐☐☐

Part A: TEACHER VARIABLES

1. What is your current employment position?

Tick one box

teacher	☐ 1
executive teacher	☐ 2
deputy principal	☐ 3
assistant principal	☐ 4
principal	☐ 5
other e.g. AST (please specify)	☐ 6

.....

2. What is your current employment status?

Tick one box

full-time	☐ 1
part-time	☐ 2
permanent casual	☐ 3
temporary casual	☐ 4

Appendix

3. If casual, why is the position not permanently filled?

.....

.....

4. What is your gender?

Tick one box

male	☐ 1
female	☐ 2

5. What is your age?

Tick one box

21 - 30 years	☐ 1
31 - 40 years	☐ 2
41 - 50 years	☐ 3
51 - 60 years	☐ 4
60+ years	☐ 5

6. What was your initial teaching qualification?

Tick one box

2 year college	☐ 1
3 year Dip Teach.	☐ 2
degree and Dip Ed	☐ 3
other (please specify)	☐ 4

.....

7. What is your highest current educational qualification?

Tick one box

2 year college	☐ 1
3 year Dip. Teach.	☐ 2
degree and Dip. Ed.	☐ 3
Grad. Dip.	☐ 4
B.Ed.	☐ 5
Masters	☐ 6
other (please specify)	☐ 7

.....

8a). What was your first teaching specialisation?

Tick one box

Early Childhood	☐1
Infants	☐2
Primary	☐3
Infants/Primary	☐4
Secondary	☐5

8b). If you answered "secondary" in the last question, please indicate your area of specialisation.

.....

9a). Have you completed at least the equivalent of 1 year full-time study in special education?

Tick one box

yes	☐1
no	☐2

9b). If you answered "yes" in the previous question, please indicate the award and the year of completion of your course/s.

Award..... Year19.....

Award..... Year19.....

10. Please indicate your years of teaching experience in the following settings.

Write the number of years

	Regular Education	Special Education
Early Childhood		
Infants		
Primary		
Secondary		
other (please specify)		

11a). Is your current position as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability your preferred teaching position?

Tick one box

yes	☐1
no	☐2
undecided	☐3

11b). If you answered "no" or "undecided" in the previous question, what is your preferred teaching position?

.....

Appendix

12. **Indicate how satisfied you are with your position as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability.**

Tick one box

very satisfied	☐ 1
satisfied	☐ 2
not satisfied	☐ 3
very dissatisfied	☐ 4

13. **If you are not satisfied with your position as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability, please explain why.**

.....

.....

14. **Indicate why you were appointed to your current teaching position (e.g. on request, lack of alternative).**

.....

.....

15a). **Do you want to be in a position teaching students with a mild intellectual disability in 2 years time?**

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2
undecided	☐ 3

15b). **Please comment on your response to the above question.**

.....

.....

16a). **Are you likely to be in a position teaching students with a mild intellectual disability in 2 years time?**

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2
don't know	☐ 3

16b). **Please comment on your response to the above question.**

.....

.....

17. **What factors have made your role as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability easier?**

.....

.....

18. **What factors have made your role as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability more difficult?**

.....

.....

19. **What changes would you like to make/to be made, to help you in your role as a teacher of students with a mild intellectual disability?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

20. **For your class, please indicate the number of:**

Write a number in the appropriate boxes

	Boys	Girls
students in your class		
students with more than one disability		
students with behaviour problems		
students who are partly integrated into mainstream classes		
students from a non-English speaking background		
students who are fully integrated into mainstream classes		

21. **If your students are partly or fully integrated into mainstream classes, what are the subjects involved?**

.....

.....

22. **If your students are partly or fully integrated into mainstream classes, how is the regular class teacher selected?**

.....

.....

23. Apart from mild intellectual disability, do any children in your class have any of the following disabilities?

Tick one box per row

	Yes	*No*
physical	☐1	☐2
sensory	☐1	☐2
behavioural	☐1	☐2
moderate intellectual	☐1	☐2

24. What do you believe should be the optimal number of students for your class?

Write a number in the box

☐

25. How much input do you have about the placement of new students in your class?

Tick one box

- extensive ☐1
- moderate ☐2
- little ☐3
- none ☐4

26. What information do you receive about new students entering your class (e.g. age, previous performance, level of functioning)?

.....

.....

27. Of the students in your class, how many would you say are appropriately placed in a class for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Write a number in each box

Boys ☐ Girls ☐

28. If your students are not appropriately placed in a class for students with a mild intellectual disability, please comment as to why you feel this way.

.....

.....

.....

.....

29. How much input do you have in the review of student placements?

Tick one box

- extensive ☐1
- moderate ☐2
- little ☐3
- none ☐4

30. To what extent does the review of student placements lead to a transfer if the student is no longer appropriately placed in a class for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

- always ☐1
- often ☐2
- seldom ☐3
- never ☐4

31. Do you teach classes other than your IM class?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

32. If you teach subjects to mainstream classes, do you take your IM class with you?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

33. If you teach subjects to mainstream classes, what are these subjects and how many periods per week do you teach them?

Complete the boxes as appropriate

Subject	Periods/week

34. What specialist subjects are taught by other teachers to your class (e.g. art - 2 periods per week).

Complete the boxes as appropriate

Subject	Periods/week

Appendix

35a). Do you provide support to **students** in other classes who are performing at a level similar to the students in your IM class?

Tick one box

- yes ☐ 1
- no ☐ 2

35b). If "yes",

- how many students ☐☐
- total periods per week ☐☐

36a). Do you provide support to **teachers/s** of students in other classes who are performing at a level similar to students in your IM class?

Tick one box

- yes ☐ 1
- no ☐ 2

36b). If "yes",

- how many teachers ☐☐
- how many hours ☐☐

37. How important do you consider parental involvement is for secondary students in an IM class?

Tick one box

- very important ☐ 1
- important ☐ 2
- of little importance ☐ 3
- unimportant ☐ 4

38. How would you describe the involvement level of parents of the students currently in your IM class?

Tick one box

- highly involved ☐ 1
- involved ☐ 2
- low involvement ☐ 3
- uninvolved ☐ 4

39a). **How much access do you have to the following support services/staff in your school?**

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher (learning difficulties)				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

39b). **How much access would you like to have to the following?**

Tick one box per row

	extensive	moderate	limited	none
School counsellor				
Support teacher (learning difficulties)				
Teacher's aide/clerical assistant				
Therapy services				
Specialist facilities				
Volunteers				
Itinerant services (please specify)				
other (please specify)				

Appendix

Part B: SCHOOL VARIABLES

40a). How accepted do you feel as a full member of staff?

Tick one box

fully accepted	☐ 1
reasonably accepted	☐ 2
tolerated	☐ 3
rejected	☐ 4

40b). Please comment on your response to the previous question.

.....

.....

.....

.....

41a). In your present teaching situation, do you feel comfortable with the equity, in relation to other teachers, of:

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No	NA
playground duty roster			
teaching hours roster			
release time			
allocation of resources			
allocation of room/s			
bus supervision			
other (please specify)			

41b). If you answered "no" to any of the above please elaborate.

.....

.....

.....

42a). Do you consider that the physical location of your base classroom within the school is appropriate?

Tick one box

yes	☐ 1
no	☐ 2

42b). Please comment on your response to the previous question.

.....

.....

.....

43. Please select one of the following to describe the location of your class.

Tick one box

main building	☐1
portable	☐2
moves or changes location	☐3
other (please specify)	☐4

.....

44. If planned integration occurs in your school, do the following types of integration occur?

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
academic	☐1	☐2
social/playground	☐1	☐2
extra-curricular	☐1	☐2
assemblies	☐1	☐2
class visits	☐1	☐2
sport	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

45. How supportive of **academic** integration of students with a mild intellectual disability do you consider the following groups in your school to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your IM students				
Other students				

Appendix

46. How supportive of **non-academic** integration of students with a mild intellectual disability do you consider the following groups in your school to be?

Tick one box per row

	very supportive	supportive	tolerated	antagonistic
Executive staff				
Other teachers				
Ancillary staff				
Parents and community				
Your IM students				
Other students				

Part C: CURRICULUM VARIABLES

As there is no Board of Studies curriculum specifically for students with a mild intellectual disability, we are interested in establishing what curriculums are being used by teachers and how effective IM teachers think such curriculums are.

47. Please indicate if you use the following curriculum/s.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Board of Studies curriculum	☐1	☐2
School based	☐1	☐2
School based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Activity based	☐1	☐2
Activity based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
Special Unit based	☐1	☐2
Special Unit based plus Key Learning Areas	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

48. Please list the Board of Studies curriculum/s (if any) that you use and describe the way in which you use it.

Complete and tick the boxes as appropriate

Name of curriculum and specific year levels used	I use the curriculum as is	I adapt the curriculum

49. Please indicate the use of Board of studies curriculum/s (if any) by specialist teachers who teach your class.

Complete and tick the boxes as appropriate

Name of curriculum and specific year levels used	They use the curriculum as is	They adapt the curriculum

50. For teaching areas where you do not use curriculum developed by the Board of Studies, please explain why you prefer to use an alternative.

.....

.....

.....

.....

51. How would you rate the effectiveness of the curriculum/s that you use?

Tick one box

- very effective ☐1
- effective ☐2
- ineffective ☐3
- very ineffective ☐4

52a). Should there be a specific curriculum for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

Appendix

52b). If "yes", indicate whether the following should be responsible for its development.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
IM teachers	☐1	☐2
Special Education teachers in other schools	☐1	☐2
School Executive (Special Education)	☐1	☐2
School Executive (non Special Education)	☐1	☐2
parents	☐1	☐2
students	☐1	☐2
Regional Dept. of School Ed. (Special Education)	☐1	☐2
Special Education Directorate	☐1	☐2

53a). Should there be a separate secondary curriculum for students with a mild intellectual disability?

Tick one box

yes	☐1
no	☐2

53b). If "yes" how should the content be organised?

Tick one box

Key Learning Areas	☐1
Functional Areas	☐2
Individual needs	☐3
other (please specify)	☐4

.....

53c). If there should be a separate secondary curriculum how comprehensive should the content and scope of this curriculum be?

Tick one box

very comprehensive	☐1
broad topics only	☐2
ideas for school-based development	☐3
other (please specify)	☐4

.....

Part D: PROGRAMMING VARIABLES

54. What is your usual pattern of programming?

Tick one box

- < 1 week ahead ☐1
- 1-4 weeks ahead ☐2
- 5-10 weeks ahead ☐3
- > 1 term ahead ☐4
- retrospectively ☐5
- fixed program ☐6
- other (please specify) ☐7

.....

55. Who supervises your program?

Tick one box

- School Executive (Special Education) ☐1
- School Executive (non Special Education) ☐2
- other (please specify) ☐3

.....

56. How often is your program supervised?

Tick one box

- never ☐1
- every week ☐2
- every 1-4 weeks ☐3
- every 5-10 weeks ☐4
- about twice a year ☐5
- annually ☐6
- other (please specify) ☐7

.....

57a). Do you consider the programming support you receive to be adequate?

Tick one box

- yes ☐1
- no ☐2

57b). If "no", indicate whether you require the following types of further support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
inservice	☐1	☐2
feedback on programs	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

58. How competent do you feel to program in the following areas?

Tick one box per row

	very competent	competent	limited skills	not competent
Numeracy Skills				
Basic Reading Instruction				
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills				
Social Skills				
Vocational Skills				
Writing				
Personal Development				
Creative Arts				
Social and Leisure Skills				

59. For the following curriculum areas indicate if you prepare written individual, group and/or class programs.

Tick the appropriate box/es in each row

	Written programs	Group programs	Class programs	Not applicable
Numeracy Skills				
Basic Reading Instruction				
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills				
Social Skills				
Vocational Skills				
Writing				
Personal Development				
Creative Arts				
Social and Leisure Skills				

60. Which teaching strategies do you use in the following areas?

Tick the appropriate boxes in each row

	data-based instruction	individual-ised instruction	small group instruction	whole class instruction	co-operative learning	thinking/ planning skills	other - please specify
Numeracy Skills							
Basic Reading Instruction							
Extension of Basic Literacy Skills							
Social Skills							
Vocational Skills							
Writing							
Personal Development							
Creative Arts							
Social and Leisure Skills							

61. If your students are integrated into mainstream classes who generally takes responsibility for:

Tick one box per row

	IM teacher	Regular class teacher	Collaboratively	Not applicable
Assessment				
Program content				
Writing the program				
Collation of resources				
Evaluation				
Follow-up procedures				

62. Please indicate if you are involved in the following collaborative programs.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
"Staying On"	☐1	☐2
Transition Education	☐1	☐2
Joint Schools-TAFE	☐1	☐2
Skill Share	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

Appendix

63. **When programming for individual students, do you regularly use the following?**

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Student profiles	☐1	☐2
On-going assessments	☐1	☐2
Formal assessments	☐1	☐2
Contracts	☐1	☐2
other (please specify)	☐1	☐2

.....

64. **If you and your students are involved in any collaborative program outside the Department of School Education (e.g. Scouts, voluntary work), please specify.**

.....

.....

.....

65. **Please indicate the most frequent type of records you keep in the following teaching situations.**

Tick one box per row

	anecdotal	test results	on-going graphs	checklists	formal reports	student self-monitoring	samples of work
individual student							
group							
class							

66. **Please indicate how often you use the following means to communicate on student progress with parents.**

Tick the most appropriate box in each row

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Each term	Twice a year	Annually	Do not use
Contracts							
Standard school reports							
Interviews							
Special class reports							
Informal social contact							
Insert in standard school report							
Telephone conversation							
Communication book							

Secondary

67. How often do you use the following behaviour management strategies for your students?

Tick one box per row

	never	*occasionally*	*frequently*
contracts			
loss of privileges			
'time out' in class			
'time out' out of class			
early mark			
tokens			
class points			
individual points			
free time			
class excursions			
other (please specify)			

68. Please indicate if you use the following methods of student support.

Tick one box per row

	Yes	No
Peer tutoring (by students in your own class)	☐1	☐2
Peer tutoring (by students from another class)	☐1	☐2
Parent tutoring in school	☐1	☐2
Team teaching (e.g. with support teacher)	☐1	☐2
Withdrawal (e.g. by support teacher)	☐1	☐2
Volunteer workers and organisations	☐1	☐2

69a). How well are your students' needs being met by the programs offered at your school?

Tick one box

- very effectively ☐1
- effectively ☐2
- somewhat effectively ☐3
- not at all ☐4

69b). Please comment on your above answer

.....

.....

.....

70. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your interest, time and patience

Please complete the identifying sheet and place it in the envelope marked 'Identifying Sheet', then place the survey form and the identifying sheet envelope in the reply paid envelope and mail within two weeks. The identifying sheet and survey form will be separated by a research assistant immediately on receipt.

University of Newcastle
Special Education Centre

Services to students with a mild intellectual disability

Structured Interview

TEACHER FACTORS

1. Satisfaction with job

- Is an IM position your preferred position?
  Why/why not?
- If you would like to change your position, in what area would you like to work?
- If you could make a change within your current position, what is the most important change you would make?
  Why would you make this change?
- Do you feel that you are adequately informed about the current and possible future roles of the IM teacher?
- Do you feel that you have the formal qualifications and/or practical expertise to fulfil your role as an IM teacher?
  Why/Why not?
- Do you feel that adequate professional development support is available for IM teachers?
  Why?
  Please list any specific professional development areas you consider to be a priority for IM teachers?

2. Promotions

- Are you interested in your promotion in the teaching service?
- What promotions avenues do you feel are open to you?
- Are you satisfied with these avenues?
- Are you encouraged to work towards promotion?

3. Attitude to integration

- There are various attitudes to the inclusion of students with mild intellectual disabilities into regular classes ranging from the view that they should spend all their time in a separate class through to mainstreaming for some activities/ subjects through to total inclusion of all students in regular classes possibly with support from appropriate personnel.
  What is your view of this and why?
- What do you think teachers of regular classes think about this?
- What do you think students with a mild intellectual disability think about this?
- What do you think parents of students with a mild intellectual disability think about this?
- Do you think a policy of inclusion of students with a mild intellectual disability into regular classes would have any effect on the rest of the students in these classes?

SCHOOL FACTORS

- **How satisfied are you with the quantity and the quality of the supervision you receive?**

- *(Omit for SSP)* **In comparison with mainstream teachers at your school, do you feel that your role as an IM teacher is a valued one?**
  Explain.

- **Do you see yourself as an integral member of the school in which you teach?**

- **Do you teach any other classes or subjects in the school?**

- **How are you involved in other school activities outside the classroom?**

- **Are you satisfied with the way in which your students are provided for on the school timetable?**
  Explain.

- *(Secondary only)* **Comment on the level and quantity of the integration of your IM students in the following school settings:**
  . elective classes (e.g. a group of students with a mild intellectual disability attends an elective class)
  . integrated classes (e.g. one or more students with a mild intellectual disability are integrated into a mainstream class/es)
  . other school activities (e.g. school assemblies, sport, excursions)
  . in the playground

- *(Omit for ESSP)* **How are other teachers who take your class selected?**
  What is your view of this process?

- **How do the following people regard the IM program at your school?**
  students with a mild intellectual disability
  regular students
  parents of students with a mild intellectual disability
  parents of regular students
  teaching staff within the school
  general staff within the school
  regional staff

- **Do you believe the students in your IM class/program are appropriately placed?**
  Explain.

- **To what extent does this placement meet the needs of your students?**
  Explain?

- **Do you feel that any groups of students are overly represented in your classroom/program?**
  If so, who are they?

- **Do you have access to formal school support services (e.g. STLD, ISTB, therapy, Counsellor)?**
  Are you satisfied with the level of support you are receiving from these services?

- **Do you use informal types of school support (e.g. executive staff, other staff)?**

- **What provision is made for your class when you are absent?**
  Does this differ from other classes in your school?

- **Do you provide support for other teachers?**
  What form does this take?

CURRICULUM

- Describe what types of curriculum resources are available to you.
- Do you develop your own curricula?
- How do you develop your own curricula?
- Do you feel that the curriculum you are using meets the needs of your students?
  Explain.

PROGRAMMING

- Do you feel that you have sufficient professional expertise and experience to develop appropriate programs for your students?
  Explain.
- Do you require support in developing programs for your students?
  If so, where does this support come from and is it adequate?
- Are you satisfied with the quality of programming developed by other staff for your students in elective and integrated classes?
  Explain.
- What collaboration occurs between yourself and other teachers responsible for your class?
  Are you satisfied with this collaboration?
- What collaboration occurs between yourself and other professionals who provide support for your students?
  Are you satisfied with this collaboration?
- How confident do you feel in the selective use of support offered by other professionals?

TEACHING STRATEGIES

- Which instructional strategies do you use most frequently?
  Why?
- Do you see a place for other instructional strategies (e.g. co-operative learning, planning/thinking skills) for your students?
  Why?
- How much emphasis do you have to give to the development and maintenance of behaviour management programs for the students in your class?
  Does this impact significantly on your other class programs?
  Explain.
- Are you satisfied with the current level of personnel resources (e.g. teachers' aides, funding) to which you have access?
  Why?
- Are you satisfied with the current level of material resources (e.g. equipment, funding) to which you have access? Why?
- Is your special education funding available to you only or is it allocated/utilised elsewhere (e.g. across the school)?
- Is there anything else you would like to add?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

Schedule of observations during the week:

1. Three classroom observation scales per day
2. One classroom daily activities sheet per day
3. One weekly summary sheet

1. Classroom observation scale (COS)

Complete the observation scale on three different lessons each day. The observations should be completed: one before recess, one between recess and lunch and one after lunch. Try to watch the same lesson or lesson type each day if possible. Restrict observations to lessons taught by the IM target teacher although you should accompany both the IM teacher and the IM class at different times to give a complete view of the IM program.

Observations on the COS need to occur over a 40 minute period which may cover more that one lesson in ESSP, Primary IM or one period in Secondary IM classes. Following 5 minutes observation, the observer should record a tick in each box only if the behaviour occurred in that 5 minute period.

2. Classroom daily activities sheet

Complete each of the four sections during the day as the opportunity arises. Particular attention should be given to the parts of the day not covered in the COS.

3. Weekly summary

The weekly summary sheet should be completed at the end of the week to provide a cover sheet for observations throughout the week as well as any other observations that may be appropriate. Note the additional information that needs to be obtained.

University of Newcastle

Special Education Centre

Services to Student with a mild intellectual disability

Classroom Observation Scale

School .....Code ..... *5 minute observation*

Date ..... Time..... *2minute recording*

Lesson .....

Number of students in room .....

A. CLASSROOM OPERATION

1. CO-OPERATION

a) Students help one another with tasks - **teacher-initiated** by arranging small groups with a common aim - positive interdependence.

b) Students help one another with tasks **teacher allows** but has **not structured** the co-operative tasks.

c) Students work **independently** and interaction in kept to a **minimum**.

d) Students appear to work competitively by shielding their work etc, but not under active encouragement from the teacher.

e) Teacher **actively discourages** students from working together. They compete for teacher attention, academic status and materials.

f) Students working individually with free interaction

1	2	3	4	5	6	Total

2. CLASSROOM INTERACTION

a) One instance of smiling or laughing by the teacher is observed.

b) One instance of joking between student/s is observed.

c) One instance of teacher expressing **no emotion** in interaction with students (neutral response).

d) One instance of teacher frowning or glaring

e) One instance of the teacher shouting, criticising and belittling student.

f) One instance of the use of physical force by the teacher with a student.

g) One instance of negative interaction between students.

h) One instance of the use of physical force by a student against another.

i) One instance of gently reprimanding

3. RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENT/ PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION

One instance of teacher commenting positively to a student/s or expressing understanding of their difficulties e.g. "you've worked hard", "aren't you sitting up straight" or expressing a positive expectation of academic success, either for the class or for and individual student.

4. TEACHER RESPONSIVENESS

The teacher responds to the questions and comments of at least **four** or **five** students.

1	2	3	4	5	6	Total

TOTAL

B. STRUCTURE

1. MONITORING STUDENT PROGRESS

The teacher gives the class or group a revision test/quiz.

2. CLARITY OF PRESENTATION

a) More than **three** children ask for clarification of instructions before and/or during seatwork.

b) The teacher presents a lesson plan to students with at least **two** components, e.g. tells what will take place in the lesson and how the students will proceed.

3. FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS

a) The teacher corrects oral work.

b) The teacher corrects written work.

4. TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION

The teacher initiates at least **four** or **five** interactions.

5. TEACHER INVOLVEMENT

During seatwork, the teacher is actively involved with the students by moving around the room checking, explaining etc. rather than doing unrelated tasks.

6. STRUCTURE

The teacher gives step-by-step, sequenced lesson directions (as opposed to discovery learning).

7. OUTSIDE INVOLVEMENT IN CLASSROOM

An outside person is involved in the classroom (show type e.g. STLD, parent/s)

8. TEACHER PROVIDING ASSISTANCE WHEN REQUESTED IN ORDERLY FASHION

TOTAL

C. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

a) The teacher spends virtually no time on discipline.

b) The teacher spends about **one** of the **five** minutes on discipline.

c) The teacher spend about half the observation period on discipline.

d) The teacher reprimands more than **three** different students.

e) The teacher expects the students to follow classroom rules all the time.

f) The teacher expects the students to follow classroom rules about 60-80% of the time.

g) The teacher puts few restrictions on students' behaviour.

h) The teacher uses verbal praise during the observation period.

i) Same student reprimanded two or more times

j) Non-verbal interruptions by students

TOTAL

1	2	3	4	5	6	Total

D. BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

a) contracts

b) loss of privileges

c) 'time out' in class

d) 'time out' out of class

e) early mark

f) tokens

g) class points

h) individual points

i) free time

j) class excursions

k) other (please specify)

TOTAL

E. INDEPENDENCE IN THE CLASSROOM

One instance of teacher encouragement of student independence by:

a) Providing self-correcting materials

b) Expecting students to organise own work materials

c) Providing adapted instructions for different ability levels in the class

d) Delegating authority to students e.g. class monitors, peer tutors etc.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
TOTAL							

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

A. Total Classroom Climate							
B. Total Structure							
C. Total Classroom Management							
D. Total Independence in the Classroom							

CLASSROOM DAILY ACTIVITIES SHEET - A. CLASS ACTIVITIES

DATE: .....

TIME	STUDENT ACTIVITIES	ADULT ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES

CLASS ACTIVITIES (CONT.)

TIME	STUDENT ACTIVITIES	ADULT ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES

CLASSROOM DAILY ACTIVITIES SHEET - B TEACHING MATERIALS

DATE: .....

TEACHING RESOURCE	HOW USED	WHERE USED

CLASSROOM DAILY ACTIVITIES SHEET - C STUDENT INTEGRATION

DATE: .....

IM STUDENT(S)	WHERE INTEGRATED	TIME	PURPOSE

CLASSROOM DAILY ACTIVITIES SHEET - D TEACHING STRATEGIES

DATE: .....

Note which teaching strategies are used during the day and the subjects involved:

	Time Spent	Lesson Type	How used	Comments
DBI				
II				
SGI				
WCI				
PTWC				
PTOC				

DBI Data-based instruction
II Individualised instruction
SGI Small group instruction
WCL Whole class instruction
PTWC Peer tutoring from within class
PTOC Peer tutoring from outside class

CLASSROOM DAILY ACTIVITIES SHEET - D TEACHING STRATEGIES (Continued)

Note which teaching strategies are use during the day and the subjects involved:

	Time Spent	Lesson Type	How used	Comments
TT				
WD				
TPSI				
COOL				
NI				
O				

TT Team teaching (specify with whom) .....
WD Withdrawal (Specify by whom).....
TPSI Thinking, planning skill instruction
COOL Co-operative learning
N No instruction

CLASSROOM DAILY ACTIVITIES SHEET - E. MANAGEMENT

For each day note the use of techniques:

	Never	occasionally	frequently
contracts			
loss of privileges			
'time out' of class			
'time out' in class			
early mark			
tokens			
class points			
individual points			
free time			
class excursions			
other (please specify)			

WEEKLY SUMMARY SHEET

CODE: ..... LOCATION: .....

DATES OF VISIT: .....

MATERIALS TO COLLECT

The following should be collected if possible:

Class timetables ☐

Teacher's timetable ☐

Sample program pages ☐

Report form to participate ☐

Assessment documentation ☐

SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED (Tick those collected)

COS 1A ☐ 1B ☐ 1C ☐

2A ☐ 2B ☐ 2C ☐

3A ☐ 3B ☐ 3C ☐

4A ☐ 4B ☐ 4C ☐

5A ☐ 5B ☐ 5C ☐

CDAS 1A ☐ 1B ☐ 1C ☐ 1D ☐ 1E ☐

2A ☐ 2B ☐ 2C ☐ 2D ☐ 2E ☐

3A ☐ 3B ☐ 3C ☐ 3D ☐ 3E ☐

4A ☐ 4B ☐ 4C ☐ 4D ☐ 4E ☐

5A ☐ 5B ☐ 5C ☐ 5D ☐ 5E ☐